

THE
METHODIST MAGAZINE,
AND
Quarterly Review.

VOL. XVII, No. 4. OCTOBER, 1835. NEW SERIES—VOL. VI, No. 4.

A SERMON ON THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

BY THE REV. JOHN DEMPSTER.

"Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."—Hebrews i, 3.

THIS epistle to the Hebrews is a masterly production of a masterly mind. It sheds a light on the economy of God in the Jewish Church, which shines from no other source. It develops the deep import of the temple service, much of which would have otherwise remained enigmatical. The first chapter is an appropriate introduction to the whole epistle, and 'for importance of subject, dignity of expression, harmony and energy of language, compression and yet distinction of ideas, it is equal if not superior to any other part of the New Testament.' (*Clarke's Commentary.*) The verse we have chosen for a text may be deemed the most lofty part of this astonishing chapter. It at once presents the *mysterious person* of our Redeemer in His two natures. It gives an elevated description of His *Godhead*, by entitling Him the outbeaming of His Father's glory, the express image of His person, and the upholder of all things by the word of His power. It involves the *necessity* of His *human* nature, by ascribing to Him the purgation of our sins, and assigning to Him a seat at the right hand of the Divine majesty, to which, even in His *human* nature, He had mounted to effectuate, by His intercession, the lofty purposes of His mercy. We have therefore selected this text as an appropriate foundation of the arguments we intend to submit to you, in support of our *Savior's supreme Divinity*.

After a few remarks on the term PERSON, which occurs in the text, and has held a distinguished place in theology, we shall proceed to sustain our position by showing,

I. That the works which are peculiar to Jehovah, are ascribed to Christ.

II. That the worship which belongs only to Jehovah, is rendered to Christ.

III. That the titles which can belong only to Jehovah, are appropriated to Christ.

IV. That the attributes by which the great Creator is known are claimed by the Redeemer.

V. And finally, that the Gospel proceeds on the supposition that Christ possesses supreme Divinity.

All the great truths we have stated in these propositions are suggested by the different parts of the short chapter before us. Immediately before the text, the sublime achievement of erecting the frame of the universe is, in this language, *ascribed to Christ*—‘By whom also He made the worlds.’ And in another part of the chapter we find the firmest support to our second proposition. The highest worshippers in the heavenly world are called on, by the everlasting Father, to *worship the Son*. When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, ‘And let all the angels of God *worship Him*.’ And in the next verse but one, we find proof of our third proposition, viz. in his paternal address, the Father appropriates to the Son that awful name by which Himself is known: ‘Thy *throne, O God*, is for ever and ever.’ Here the title *God* is given to the *Son*, by *Him* who alone knows all its mighty import.

The *attributes* that belong to *God* are, by implication, ascribed to Christ, by the text itself: It calls Him ‘the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of His person.’ Now the proceeding rays which are here said to shine from the Father, must have the same nature as the fountain from whence they emanate; and as He is said to be the express image of His Father’s person, there must be in the one every thing answering to what there is in the other; all the attributes ascribed to the one person must belong to the other, if He be the express image of the former. Finally, our fifth proposition is an inference from the latter clause of the text. For if by Himself He purged our sins, He must have been the *source* of *law* to have thus met its unanswered claims: that is, He must have been *God* to have been capable of *suffering meritoriously* as man. Thus within the narrow limits of this brief chapter all these *adorable perfections* are implicitly or explicitly ascribed to *Christ*.

Before we advance to the designed proof of our position, we shall make a passing remark on the term *PERSON*, which occurs in the text. This *term* has generally been used to express an individual substance of an intelligent nature; and when so used it implies a *separate* being. Were it so used when applied to the *Father, Son, and Spirit*, it would signify *three Gods*. But the Scriptures most explicitly teach, what all Jews and Christians believe, that there is but one God; and at the same time they explicitly ascribe *acts* to the *Father, Son, and Spirit*, respectively, which characterize *personality*. The term is therefore used by Trinitarians to express *distinct agents*, but not *separate agents*, in the Godhead. From the nature of the case then, the term *person* has not in all respects the same meaning when applied to God, as when applied to *man*; and this, indeed, is true of most other words when applied to express what is *peculiar* to *God*. In the common use of the word we have been accustomed to contemplate *personality* only in connection with *separation of being*. But, by proper attention to the subject it will be perceived that separation of being is merely an *accidental* circumstance, usually attendant on personality, but not *necessarily arising out of personality*. For ‘the circumstance of *separation* forms no part of the idea of personality itself, which is confined to the *capability of performing PERSONAL ACTS*.’ ‘In God the distinct *persons* are represented as having a common *foundation in one being*; but this union also forms no part of the *idea of personality*, nor can

be proved inconsistent with it. Considering then neither *union* nor *separation* essential to *personality*, but merely *accidental* to it, the objection which the rejecters of our Lord's Divinity urge against the idea which this term expresses must be powerless. The *distinctness* of *person*, expressed by the pronouns I, THOU, HE, is *essential* to the personal character, as ascribed to the *Trinity*. Thus we find the very frequent occurrence of these terms, both in the addresses of the Father to the Son, and in those of the Son to the Father, and by the pronoun HE our Lord generally speaks of the Holy Spirit. Likewise WE and US are repeatedly used in the Old Testament, when Jehovah speaks of *Himself alone*. In using the term *person*, then, in this definite sense, no absurdity can be involved in maintaining that God consists in THREE as to PERSONS, and in only ONE as to BEING.* As then no one doubts the existence of the Father, or the unity of the Godhead, should we prove that Christ is the *true God*, we shall have thereby proved that *more than one person* exists in *one being*.

We shall now proceed to lay before you some of the evidences and arguments by which we prove,

First, That the works which are peculiar to Jehovah are ascribed to Christ.

That the creation of the heavens and the earth, with all they contain, is claimed in the Old Testament by Jehovah, we need not detain you to prove; for none can have read the Jewish Scriptures without knowing that the supreme God there distinguished Himself from all other beings, by His *claim* to have *created all things* that exist. Now should we find this great claim *asserted* by, and *accorded* to Christ, in the Scriptures, the conclusion will be, what God claims to the exclusion of all else in the universe *belongs to Christ*; and that therefore Christ is God. By adverting to the first chapter of John's Gospel, we will find *the work of creation ascribed to Christ*, in the most express language that could have been employed. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; all things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made.' Here it is affirmed that the *Word* was in the *beginning*, that it was *with God* in the *beginning*, that *it was God*, that all things were *created by it*; *all things*, in the most comprehensive sense, for without the *Word* was not *any thing created* that was made. Now should the term *made* be understood to signify nothing more than

* The question often propounded is, Can three be but one, or can one be three, while it remains still but one? But the question identifies the two different senses, in which the terms *one* and *three* are used; and by doing this, it creates the absurdity which it groundlessly charges on Trinitarians. They use the term *one* to signify a being, and *three*, to signify the *MODES* in which a *being* exists.—Were these terms so used as to imply *THREE beings* in *ONE being*, or *THREE PERSONS* in *ONE PERSON*, they would state what no rational being could believe; for no one understanding the *terms* could believe that *three things* made but *one* of the *three*; or that *one thing* made *three like itself*, any more than he could believe that the *whole* is *greater* than *all* its parts, or that a *part* is as great as the *whole*. But when *person* is used not to express a *separate Being*, only a *mode* of the Divine existence, it can involve no absurdity to affirm of *three persons* that they are but *one being*; or of *one being*, that he exists in *three persons*. Now this plain *distinction* between a *person* and a *separate being*—between a being that simply has existence, and the *modes* in which it exists, obviates all objections urged on the ground of confounding numbers, and leaves our way unobstructed in which we are to proceed in sustaining the fact thus stated.

arranging and *setting in order* the new dispensation, as the Socinians contend, it convicts the Evangelists of this 'pitiful truism,' that Christ did nothing in establishing His religion which He did not do. But when this passage is taken in connection with several that follow it, how is it conceivable that any can understand it as signifying less than *creating* the *physical* world? For here it is asserted that the world was made by Him; that *very world* into which He came as a 'light;' that *very world* in which He 'was made flesh;' that *same world* which 'received Him not.' Now if it be asserted that the words, 'the world was made by Him,' mean a moral renewal, it must either be maintained that the natural world has been morally renewed by Christ, or that the world, here meaning men, was morally renewed by Christ, and yet did *not receive* Him; either of which would be too absurd to argue against.

Thus these efforts, and the most strenuous that have been made to make the beginning of the Gospel teach any thing but the *supreme Divinity* of Christ, end in the *confusion* of the system they aim to support. But let us view still more narrowly the passage in question.—By this text we understand that *nothing* was *made* but by the *Word*, which was in the beginning with God. This shows it impossible that the '*beginning*' should refer to any later period, than the first moment when the creation began to arise; otherwise the *Word* by whom the creation was made, would have acted *before it existed*. It teaches the *Word* was never created, for it declares without Him—the *Word*—was nothing made that was made; if, therefore, the *Word* was created, it *created itself*, that is, it acted before it existed, which is impossible. The text then teaches that the *Word* is uncreated.

Now as there can be no possible existence between that which *was created*, and Him who *always* existed, to the *Word* must belong an *unbeginning* existence. Hence the peculiar sense fixed on the expression 'the *Word* was with God;' with Him as no other being *can be*; with Him in *creative power*; with Him in *uncreated essence*; with Him so as to be God.

But if this passage in John's Gospel ascribes the whole *physical creation* to the power of Christ, and thereby proves him to be the *uncreated* the eternal God, one in the epistle to the Colossians does it no less explicitly—'For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by Him, and for Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist,' Col. i, 16–17. In these two verses there are four facts stated of Christ, each one of which could *characterize* none but the *Supreme Being*. 1st. It is affirmed that by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are on earth. By using nearly the same language adopted by Moses where he informs us that 'God created the heavens and the earth;' the apostle evidently intended to designate *Christ* as the *God* of which *Moses speaks*. Now as it is impossible that *each* of two beings should have created the same heavens and earth, and as Moses ascribes this work to God, and the apostle to Christ, the conclusion is irresistible that *Christ is God*. But the apostle is both more *comprehensive* and more *particular* than the historian; Moses ascribes to God in this passage only what is corporeal; the apostle ascribes to Christ *all this*, together with all incorporeal

existences: not only all things visible, but likewise all things invisible, all the hierarchies of the heavenly world; ascending through all the ranks of angelic natures, he showed them to be but *beams of Christ's brightness*. Thus in the immense embrace of his expression the apostle includes all worlds and all natures. 2d. But lest the mighty work of giving existence to all that has being should be imputed to power with which Christ was delegated, the apostle assures us that all things were created *for Him*; that He is not only the creator but the proprietor of all worlds. Could He have acted as an instrument, the creation He formed would have belonged to *Him* who employed the instrument—to *Him* who communicated the power to create. But as all things were made *for Him*, He must *always* have been enrobed with creative power, Rom. i, 20. The apostle proceeds to state that He is *before all things*; before all the things that He had created, before all things that were ever created, otherwise He could not have created all things. Had *He* been *created*, the text could not be true, that all the visible and invisible, in heaven and earth, matter and spirit, were created by Him. Nor could it be true that He was *before all things* that were created; for were He a created being, as the rejecters of His Divinity contend, the text would make Him exist before He existed. And this is one of those absurdities in which that class of men is unavoidably involved. But it is added in this passage, that 'by Him do all things *consist*.' Here the same by whom all things were created, the same for whom all things were created, the same who was before all things—is the very same by whom all things consist. By the word of His power the mighty fabric of all worlds is borne up: men and angels, all that has life, live and move in Him.

I know not that in all the Divine records a higher ascription of almighty power is made to the omnipotent God than is here made to Jesus Christ.

As then the whole creation is ascribed to Christ, and as St. Paul informs us, Rom. i, 20, that the eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen in the creation, that eternal power and Godhead must belong to Christ. But if a created being could have made the world, the apostle cannot be correct in stating that it is a standing *proof of eternal power and Godhead*; for then it would not show forth the Godhead of the eternal, but merely the powers of the creature.

But not only building and sustaining the creation are ascribed to Christ, but the removal of the material universe is also to be effected by His power. In the first chapter to the Hebrews the Father says to the Son, 'And thou LORD in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands: these shall perish, but thou remainest; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed.' Here unbounded power is seen changing, removing, and wrapping together the whole universe of material things, with the same ease and majesty with which it first raised them from nothing, arranged their materials, and sustained the fabric. And all this incommunicable power is, by the mouth of the Father, ascribed to Christ. Now, if God and Christ are not the *same Being*, as Christ is declared the creator of all things, God can have created nothing; as all things were made for Christ, God possesses nothing; as all things

consist by Christ, God upholds nothing. By this system, therefore, the adorable Jehovah is robbed of His whole empire. He can deserve no worship from any being, for He is neither the author, upholder, nor proprietor of any.

But not merely do the great works of making, preserving, and finally removing the material universe, properly belong to Christ; but also such a control of the elements of nature, the power of death, and the spirits of darkness, as prove Him supreme.

That the power of working miracles was His own cannot be doubted when we attend to the facts, that He wrought them in His own name; when He restored to life the widow's son, His language was, 'Young man, *I say unto thee, Arise;*' when He called putrefied Lazarus from the grave, whose *power* did He invoke? whose *name* did He use but His own? 'Lazarus, come forth,' was sufficiently efficacious to raise his corpse from the tomb, and call his spirit from eternity. That this was an original power of His own, appears also from His having bestowed it on His disciples, Luke x, 12, 'Behold I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you.' Luke xi, 1, 'And He gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.' Thus the power of working miracles He expressly reserves to Himself. '*In my name shall they cast out devils.*' '*His name*, through faith in His name, hath made this man strong.' The prophets wrought stupendous miracles, but they never did attempt them in their *own name*. It was not Moses, but the rod of God, that so controlled the elements of nature. The apostles wrought miracles that blazed through a whole age, but they were *shocked* if any thought of ascribing them to their *own 'power or holiness.'* All the wonder-working men that wrought miracles in any age acted then not as AGENTS, but merely as INSTRUMENTS. Of all the beings that have ever appeared among men, Christ alone has ever *pretended* to work 'the *works* of His Father.'

Another act of Christ demonstrative of His Godhead is, His having given the Holy Spirit. 'If I go away I will send the Comforter.'—This is the language of one possessing the original right to send forth the eternal Spirit—to communicate that miracle-working power that wrought all the deeds of a God. It is also said of the Spirit, 'whom the Father shall send;' but Christ claims to do the same: 'The Comforter whom *I will send* unto you.' 'Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, *He hath shed forth this* which ye now see and hear.' Thus the Holy Ghost is called indifferently the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God.

The prerogative to FORGIVE SINS, which belonged to Christ, proves Him to be God. A man or angel may be commissioned to announce the principles on which the eternal Sovereign will forgive sin, but no created being can possess the *right* to pardon it. The party offended, alone, can obviously possess the right to pardon the offender; for if 'sin is the transgression of the *law of God,*' He is the object offended. What is it then for a mere *creature to forgive sin*, but to take in his own hands the *rights* of the infinite Jehovah? It is not questioned whether the Supreme Being can reveal to His servants the fact of another's pardon, and they declaratively pronounce that pardon; but this is no

more *authoritatively* granting pardon, than it is to usurp Jehovah's throne. To Him who is the *source* of law, which sin violates—the *author* of that government on which it tramples—to *Him alone* it can belong *authoritatively* to *pardon it*. Now, in *this very manner* we find Christ forgiving sin. He said to the sick of the palsy, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy *sins be forgiven thee*.' But when the scribes charged Christ with blaspheming because He thus assumed the prerogative of God, did our Lord retract,—did He attempt to correct their mistaken view of His pretensions? Directly the reverse! He proceeded to support His *claims to Divinity* in the *very light* they had considered Him making those claims. 'But that ye may know that the *Son of man* hath power on earth to *forgive sins*; then said He to the sick of the palsy, "Arise, take up thy bed and go to thine own house."—Here was a miracle wrought, unquestionably, to prove Himself *possessed* of power to forgive sins. He therefore was the source of law. He was the party offended. He was God.

May we be permitted now to call your attention to the fact, secondly, That the worship which belongs only to Jehovah is rendered to Christ. It is a fact, of which no reader of the New Testament can remain ignorant, that instances are frequently occurring there, of persons prostrating themselves in worship before Christ. But attempts have been made to show that as in the east prostration before civil rulers was a common practice, so its being paid to Christ can furnish no proof of His Divinity. But nothing can be plainer than that Christ never *received worship* as a civil governor, for He most cautiously avoided giving the least sanction to the idea that he had any *civil pretensions*. Now in the midst of all this care to excite not the least suspicion that He aspired at civil distinction, what inconsistency could be more glaring than habitually to receive worship, like a civil governor? yet where is a hint in all the Divine record of His ever refusing to receive homage, where His worshippers rendered it to Him? The leper came and '*worshipped Him*.' The man cured of blindness said, 'Lord, I believe, and *worshipped Him*.' They came and *worshipped Him*, saying, 'Thou art the Son of God,' Matt. xiv, 33. In none of those instances, or any other, did Christ intimate that worship was inappropriately paid to Him, but taught that all men should '*honor the Son even* as they honor the Father.' But to obviate all *objections* against the worship which our Lord received *being Divine*, we need only to state the fact, that it was rendered to Him after He ascended to heaven. 'He was parted from them, and received up into heaven, and they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy,' Luke xxiv, 51, 52. The worship here mentioned could not have been offered as a token of civil respect, because it was rendered *after* He was *parted from them*; after He was to show Himself in person to them no more on earth. That the HOMAGE of PRAYER is rendered to Christ, as to God, a very few quotations will convince us. 'Lord Jesus,' prayed dying Stephen, 'receive my Spirit.' 'Lord,' said he, 'lay not this sin to their charge.' In the former he acknowledges Christ to be dispenser of the ETERNAL states of men; in the latter he recognizes Him as the Governor and Judge of men, having power to *remit*, pass by, or visit, their sins. This prayer of Stephen to Christ acknowledges His property in spirits no less than the prayer of Christ

acknowledges His Father's property in spirits—' Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit.'

St. Paul's prayer to be delivered from the thorn in his flesh was evidently addressed to Christ. ' He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee : for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.' Here strength and power are the same word in the original. He to whom he prayed said, My strength is sufficient for you ; but this *strength* or *power* the apostle calls Christ's ; therefore it was Christ to whom he prayed. But, leaving unnoticed numerous instances of prayer to Christ, we will only advert to one more expression of it, found in Corinthians : ' Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, called to be saints, with all that *in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ*, our Lord, both theirs and ours.' Here the apostle states that the Church at Corinth, as well as *others* in *every place*, *call on the name of Christ*. The supreme homage of prayer was therefore rendered to Christ, through all the apostolical Churches.

Supreme ascriptions of *everlasting glory and praise* are perpetually made to Christ by the inspired writers. Among numberless passages adducible to this point, those only that follow shall be selected. ' But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, to whom be glory both now and for ever,' 2 Peter iii, 18.—' Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, to *Him* be *glory* and *dominion, for ever and ever*.' These ascriptions of eternal glory and everlasting dominion are surely appropriate to none but God, and would involve the grossest idolatry to be rendered to any created being. When the highest *benediction* is craved, Christ is *associated* with the everlasting Father : ' The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.' ' Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.' These, with little variation, are the forms of benediction habitually adopted by the apostles, in which Christ and the Father are represented as being *equally* the *source* of those highest blessings for which an inspired mind could pray. The Father and the Son must therefore *equally possess* those supreme perfections which alone could originate these blessings.

And indeed there is no fact come down to us from the first ages of Christianity, better authenticated than the fact that Christ was then worshipped by the whole Church. Heathen authorities in support of this fact, might be numerous adduced ; but to advert to the famous letter of Pliny to Trajan, where the fact is expressly stated, is sufficient. All the Arians likewise, of the fourth century, who believed Christ superangelic in His nature, with respect to worshipping Him, imitated the general Church. But supreme adoration to Christ is not confined to the Church on earth ; it is offered to Him by the *angels* of God, and the *spirits* of the just, in the highest heavens. For He saith, ' Let all the angels of God worship Him.' And in the Revelation the whole unfallen and redeemed universe are heard to make supreme ascriptions to the Lamb : ' And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the *Lamb*, for ever and ever,'

Rev. v, 13. Here, in the immediate presence of the Father, at the very foot of His throne, and amid the glories of His person, His adoring host pay no other homage to Him that sitteth on the throne than they render to the LAMB. Now in turning to the Old Testament, we find worship prohibited to any being in any world, excepting Jehovah, under the most dreadful penalty. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' 'Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them,' Exod. xx, 3-5. Christ Himself enforced the same prohibition: 'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *Him only* shalt thou serve,' Matt. iv, 10. 'He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the LORD only, he shall be utterly destroyed,' Exod. xxii, 20. The inspired apostles were Jews, and viewed religious worship as such. Idolatry had not for centuries affected their nation; and, as we have seen, their law was awfully strict in prohibiting any thing like religious worship to all but Jehovah. And they lost no occasion to insist on the great principle of exclusive worship to Him. When Cornelius would worship Peter, he hesitated not a moment to refuse it.—When those of Lystra would pay religious honors to Paul and Barnabas, they instantly forbade it, and shrunk with horror from the very attempt. When St. John (Rev. xix, 10) fell at the feet of a heavenly inhabitant, the angel interdicted even an outward act of religious homage, and insisted on the great *rule* and *maxim*, 'Worship God.' But with the fulminations of that law in their ears, which forbade worship to any in the whole universe but to God alone, the apostles *adored* Christ; in that world where no note of the eternal song is raised but to Jehovah, all the angelic and redeemed hosts adore the Messiah, with that dreadful interdict dropping from His lips, 'Him only shalt thou serve.' Christ received the highest worship from His adoring disciples; the Church therefore on earth, while under the full blaze of inspiration, and the angels in heaven before the eternal Majesty, must have been the grossest idolaters, or Jesus Christ is the supreme God. He Himself could never have taught that 'all men should honor Him as they honor the Father,' unless He and the Father are one Being.

The next evidences of our Savior's Divinity to which we shall refer, will be adduced to support the fact,

Thirdly, That the titles which can only belong to Jehovah are appropriated to Christ.

God says, 'I am Jehovah: that is my name, and my glory I will not give to another.' 'I am Jehovah: and there is none else, there is no God beside me.' Thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth.* Here the great God appropriates this name to Himself, to the exclusion of all other beings in the universe. Though in a few instances this name is found connected with persons and places, yet it is not descriptive of those persons or places, but merely of the events connected with them; which events are intended to mark the interposition of God. It is one thing for a name to be so given as to *describe* the *Divine interposition* in a place, or in behalf of a person; and it is another very different thing to make it *descrip-*

* Where the word in the original Hebrew is *Jehovah*, our translators have usually written it LORD, in capitals, to distinguish it from another word in that language which is also rendered Lord, but is frequently applied to creatures; it will be perceived that we use the word Jehovah as they have sometimes, and should have always left it.

tive of the person bearing the name. Now in this *latter sense* the name Jehovah is found applied to no created being. If then it is so applied to Christ by Divine authority, He must be *uncreated*—must be God. That it is so applied to Him, but few quotations are needful to show. St. Matthew quotes and applies to Christ the third verse of the 40th of Isaiah, 'For this is He that was spoken of by the Prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight,' Matt. iii, 3. The other evangelist makes the same application to this prophecy, representing John as the herald of *Jesus*, whom the prophet called *Jehovah*. Indeed nothing can be plainer than that He whom the prophet calls Jehovah, is that *Jesus* whom the evangelist calls the *Lord*. Jesus is therefore Jehovah. There is no doubt but the title Lord is often used in the New Testament in a subordinate sense; but whenever the writers of this Testament apply it to Him whom the Old Testament calls Jehovah, they can but use it in that *high sense* in which it would be blasphemy to apply it to any but to the Creator. In this sense it is most unquestionably used in the passage before us. Also in Luke, 'And many of the children of Israel shall He turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias,' Luke i, 15-17. Him, beyond all question, refers to the Lord their God. Christ therefore, before whom John shall go, is He whom the prophet calls *Jehovah*, their God. St. Paul makes a similar application of this ineffable name to Christ, 'Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved,' Rom. x, 13. There is a quotation from Joel, where the prophet says, 'Whosoever shall call on the name of Jehovah shall be delivered,' Joel ii, 32. As St. Peter applies this prophecy to our Savior, the 'Lord' mentioned by the apostle must be Christ, whom the prophet therefore calls Jehovah. Now should we show that God claims the name Jehovah, so as to *deny it to all other beings*, having shown that it is Divinely applied to Christ, we shall thereby prove that Christ is the *Supreme God*. 'And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them,' Exod. vi, 3.—'That men may know that thou, whose name *ALONE* is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth,' Psa. lxxxiii, 18. Here the name Jehovah is denied to all other beings, and declared to belong to God *ALONE*. Having then shown that inspiration applies it to Christ, He, most certainly, must be the supreme God.

It is certain that in the New Testament the term *God* is never applied to any man: yet, in its highest sense, it is applied to Christ.—'And they shall call His name *Immanuel*; which, being interpreted, is *God with us*,' Matt. i, 23. 'And the Word was God,' John i, 1; God in the highest possible sense, because without the Word was not any thing created that was made. The *Word* was therefore *God*, the *Creator*. 'In His Son, Jesus Christ. This is the *true God*, and eternal life,' 1 John v, 20. 'In Him dwelleth all the *fulness* of the Godhead,' Col. ii, 9. 'Who is over all, *God* blessed for ever,' Rom. ix, 5. For 'He thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God,' Phil. ii, 6. When the Jews charged Him with making 'Himself equal with God,' He therefore intended they should so understand His claim. This list of quotations might be vastly lengthened; but these are suffi-

cient, as they almost all associate the term God, as applied to our 'Savior, with other titles and circumstances which demonstrate most fully that the term was used by the inspired penman in its *highest sense of true and proper Deity* when they applied it to Christ.' In these and similar passages the term is associated with *Jehovah*; with acts of *creative energy*; with *supreme dominion*; with *eternal life*, and with terms that distinguish His human nature from His Divine nature; such as that selected from the epistle to the Romans, 'Of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, *God blessed for ever.*'

How could the New Testament writers use terms better adapted than these, to mislead the minds of men, and plunge all following generations in the deepest idolatry, if they did not intend to teach the supreme Godhead of Christ? Let us add to these evidences,

Fourthly, The arguments which prove that the attributes by which the great Creator is known, are ascribed to and claimed by Christ.

All that is known to us of God, as to His *essence*, is, that He is a Spirit. But of His attributes He has spoken to us more largely.—Beside His moral attributes, which to a limited extent are communicable, He possesses what are called *natural perfections*; the high and awful attributes, *omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, eternity*, and all others without which these could not invest Him: these, from their very nature, must for ever be incommunicable. Therefore, if all these, or any one of them, be Divinely ascribed to Christ, He is thereby proved to be the *only God* of which creation or Revelation speaks. For nothing can be more indubitable than that no one infinite attribute can *exist alone*: if it could, there might be as many infinite beings as there are infinite attributes. But as one infinite attribute necessarily supposes *a capacity for all others*, it is absurd to suppose there can be more than one being possessing such capacity. For to suppose more than one is to make all others merely a *mental repetition* of that one.

If, therefore, the Scriptures ascribe *one infinite attribute* to Christ, they thereby make Him the supreme God.

But it will appear in the sequel that *all the attributes* by which Jehovah has made Himself known, invest Jesus Christ.

ETERNITY is ascribed to Him: 'Unto us a child is born; His name shall be called the mighty God, the everlasting Father,' Isa. ix, 6.—That Christ is the subject of this description, admits of no question; not that He is the *everlasting Father* in his relation to the other persons in the Trinity, but only in relation to all else that exists; as all else is the *offspring* of His power.

To settle the question for ever, whether *eternity belongs to Christ*, nothing more can be needful than to find it claimed by Him *in the same language* in which Jehovah claims it. Now *this very thing is done* in these scriptures: 'I am the first, and the last, and beside me there is no God. Before me was there no God formed, neither shall there be after me,' Isa. xlv, 6, and xlviii, 10. 'I,' says Christ, 'am the *first and last*; I am He that liveth and was dead; *Alpha and Omega*, the *beginning* and the *end*, the *first* and the *last*,' Rev. i, 17. Concerning Christ it is said, 'Thou Bethlehem, Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, *from everlasting*,' Micah v, 2. Of Jehovah it is said,

'From everlasting to everlasting thou art God,' *Psa. xc, 2.* The self-existence and eternity of Jehovah are revealed in this peculiar language, 'I am that I am,' *Exod. iii, 14.* Evidently with an eye on this expression our Lord declared, 'Before Abraham was, I *AM*,' *John viii, 58.* Thus grasping the past and the future, Christ, like the infinite Jehovah, *pervades all duration.* Now, what could be more misleading to men, and more blasphemous in Christ, than so repeatedly to claim eternity, in the very expressions almighty God had done, were *He* not the *eternal One*? for certain it is that if any eternal being is revealed to us in these oracles, Christ is that *unbeginning existence.*

Now, the impossibility of *communicating* this attribute to any being who has not *always* possessed it, will appear from this single reflection, it makes Him *begin to be, who never began to be*; that is, it assigns existence to Him before He possessed it. For, if He can *now* be eternal who was not *always so*, He must have *existed* when He did not exist, which is impossible; if then, that which had a beginning cannot become that which had *no beginning*, the Scriptural ascription of eternity to Christ proves Him to be the uncreated God.

OMNIPRESENCE likewise invests Him. This ubiquity, or power of extending Himself over the whole universe, belongs to God *alone*, yet it enrobes our great Redeemer. 'No man,' says Christ, 'hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven,' *John iii, 13.* 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' *Matt. xviii, 20.* 'Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world,' *Matt. xxviii, 20.* In the first of these passages Christ declares Himself to be in that heaven from which, by becoming incarnate, He represents Himself as having come down; and there, too, *at the same time while He was on earth*, in the midst of His disciples. In the next text He promises to be present, *over the whole globe*, wherever two or three are met together in His name. There may be created spirits that can dart with lightning speed from place to place, and so in a brief period visit, successively, all worshipping assemblies on the footstool; but this would not fulfil the promise we are considering: '*There am I, not have been, and shall be*, which are the utmost within the power of every created being. In our third quotation He engages the apostles His attendance on them *all at all times*: 'alway to the end of the world.' This would be impossible to any creature in the universe; any but God must leave one to go to another; must be absent from all others when present with one. He that can be with *twelve apostles at the same time*, while whole continents separate them, can be at the same time with *all other beings.*

Now this all-pervading power is, by St. Paul, expressly attributed to Christ: 'by Him do all things consist.' As no being can act where it is not, and as Christ upholds all things, He must be present with all things. As He is the great conservator of all things, He can be absent from none. But if Christ is present with every being, if He fills heaven, and earth, and the whole universe, He must be wherever the Father is; He and the Father must therefore be the Supreme Being.

OMNISCIENCE also belongs to Christ: though it is impossible for us to determine to what extent the knowledge of the highest created intelligence reaches, we certainly know that it can never *extend to all things.*

For Jehovah claims the prerogative of knowing all things, to the exclusion of all other beings.

The two kinds of knowledge which consists in searching the hearts of men, and knowing all the secrets of futurity, are peculiar to Jehovah, but *both these kinds* of knowledge belong to Christ. They are claimed by Him in the New Testament, in the *same language* they are claimed by Jehovah in the Old Testament. By the knowledge of futurity, the true God distinguishes Himself from all creatures. 'I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done,' Isa. xlv, 9-10. But this knowledge of futurity belongs also to Christ. 'Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him,' John vi, 64. Though prophets and apostles have often, by express revelation, obtained a knowledge of particular events in futurity, no one ever pretended to have this knowledge from his *own power*. The moment the spirit of vision was withdrawn from the prophet, the future was a blank, dark as a starless midnight: not so with Christ, for when it is said, 'Jesus knew their thoughts,' it is added, that He PERCEIVED IN HIS SPIRIT that they so reasoned; not by a spirit that was given to Him for a particular purpose, as to the prophets, but by *His own spirit*; by an original faculty, which, as we have seen, belongs only to God.

Like God, Christ also searches the heart. 'I the Lord search the heart, and try the reins, saith Jehovah,' Jer. xvii, 10. 'And all the Churches shall know that *I am He* that searcheth the reins and the heart,' responds Jesus Christ. 'Thou, even thou, only knowest the hearts of all the children of men,' 1 Kings viii, 39. 'But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He *knew what was in man*.'—Here again Christ claims this heart-searching prerogative in 'the full style and majesty of the *Jehovah of the Old Testament*.' As then Christ expressly claims that from which God excludes all creatures, Christ cannot be a creature, but must be God Himself. To these attributes which belong to Christ, OMNIPOTENCE should also be added; as no being can possess a degree of power beyond its capacity, it is impossible that almighty power should be DELEGATED to any being in the universe. To Him who alone possesses it, there was none to give it; and He can impart it to none, unless He first bestow an infinite capacity; and to do that would be creating one equal to Himself, which is impossible. Therefore to communicate omnipotent power is not the prerogative of God Himself. If, then, Christ possess this, He must *always* have possessed it: He must be God.

That He did possess it, is evident from His own Godlike claims. 'Whatsoever things,' says He, 'the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise,' for 'all things the Father hath, are mine,' John xvi, 15. But if this be so, that Christ does whatsoever things God the Father does, and if He is the *proprietor* of all that belongs to the Father, then most certainly omnipotent power invests Him. And this is that which is most expressly ascribed to Him, where it is affirmed, 'HE IS THE ALMIGHTY,' Rev. i, 8.

Now if our great Redeemer swayed a control over all nature, if He could still the winds and the waves—cure the most inveterate dis-

eases—reject infernal spirits—pardon the sins of the guilty—summon the dead from a state of putrefaction—scrutinize the hearts of all the living—and like the God of the prophets, throw open the secrets of futurity—and all this in His own name, and by His own power—if He could be with His ministers through all the coming ages of time—be present with His worshippers wherever two or three are met in His name, over the whole globe—be exalted to absolute dominion over all beings, in earth and heaven—be the object of supreme adoration from men and angels—be associated with the Father in the highest ascriptions made to the Godhead—bear the awful names appropriated to the great Jehovah: and if He did possess those terribly sublime attributes without which there could be no God—the attributes omnipotence, omniscience, and eternity—if men and angels, earth and heaven, all things visible and invisible, owe their existence to His *fiat*, and their continuance to the word of His power—if He is to fold up creation like a garment, and remove its mighty mass when He has done with it—if He is to quicken all the dead at the resurrection morn—become the universal Judge of the accountable universe, and pronounce the unchangeable destinies of all concerned in the final judgment—if all this be so, who will deny supreme Divinity to the Savior of the world?

Finally, we were to show in the last place, That the Gospel proceeds on the supposition that Christ possesses supreme Divinity.

1. It does this first, by supposing that an *atonement for sin* has been made. That the Gospel, as a *saving system*, rests on the doctrine of atonement, is so evident to a reader of the New Testament, that the great evidences of it furnished by that volume scarcely need be thrown together. The few following scriptures, therefore, are all that shall be adduced for its support: ‘He hath made Him to be sin (a sin offering) for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.’ ‘Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.’ ‘And He is the propitiation for our sins.’ ‘Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood.’ ‘I lay down my life for the sheep.’ ‘He gave Himself for us—the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.’ ‘Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.’

By these citations, and many more similar ones that might be made, the fact of the atonement is most fully sustained. For here Christ is said to take the sinner’s place, and for the express purpose that the sinner might be made righteous through this *substitution*. And, by that strong expression of the *punitive* nature of His sufferings, He is said to be a ‘curse for us,’ for the sole object of redeeming us from the curse of the law; that when He died for the unjust, it was that *as such* He might bring them to God. And that His death propitiated the wrath of offended Majesty is here made unquestionable by the repeated assertion that He was ‘set forth to be a *propitiation* for our sins.’

But if Christ be not God, He has made *no atonement by His death*: for how could a creature supply the delinquency of other creatures? If the sufferer be a mere *creature*, his powers to suffer were *received from the Creator*. How then could he take his Maker’s property, and merit something by it from his Maker? But if the sufferer could do

something in behalf of others above what is required of him, on his own account, just so far his services might have been dispensed with,—just so far his services are dispensed with ; for justice can never REQUIRE one to merit for another. But if any part of his services can be *dispensed with*, for the same reason *all his services* may be ; and then, as his Maker has *no claim* on his services, He cannot justly punish him for devoting them to another. And if this is true concerning one created intelligence, it certainly may be true of all created intelligences ; and then the whole government of God is eternally at an end. It is therefore impossible for any created being to merit any thing from his Creator in behalf of another ; consequently Christ is either God, or there can be no *merits in His death*. This conclusion has been so powerfully felt by the rejecters of our Lord's Divinity, that now all the intelligent among them openly discard the atonement. Indeed, so clear and forcible are the reasons that conduce to *this conclusion*, that no man of letters would hazard his reputation for intelligence by embracing these premises and rejecting the conclusion.

By those less accustomed to push out principles to legitimate consequences, it has been asked, whether God could not accept *any sacrifice for sin*, which Himself might appoint, whether it were the blood of an *animal*, or of a *man*, or of *any other being* ? God can undoubtedly. But God cannot consistently appoint any sacrifice to take away sin, unless it consist of more than a mere creature. For an *arbitrary* appointment to execute a particular purpose, can add no new excellency to the *nature* of him so appointed. And it is the *excellency* of the thing sacrificed, in which alone the *merits of the sacrifice* are found. Hence the Scriptures constantly connect with the merits of the cross the very *Divinity* of the sufferer. It was Jehovah who was pierced, Zech. xii, 10. It was God that purchased the Church with His own blood, Acts xx, 28. It was the Lord that bought us, 2 Peter ii, 1. It was the Lord of glory that was sacrificed, 1 Cor. ii, 8. Indeed, if a mere *creature sacrifice* could take away sin, as some of the rejecters of our Savior's Godhead maintain, how egregiously did St. Paul blunder in asserting that it was 'not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin !'

You will readily perceive that these arguments, like nearly all we have employed in this discourse, overturn the *Arian* no less than the *Socinian* system. For the distance must ever be the same between the Creator and the *highest* created intelligence in the universe, that it is between the Creator and a mere man ; as all beings *alike* can bear no comparison to the infinite One.

I care not then how high you place Christ above the brightest cherub that burns in Jehovah's presence ; only deny Him *supreme Divinity*, and you make Him no less a dependent being than the infant that sleeps in your arms. For what can be more chimerical than to imagine a being between the creature and the Creator, one that was neither made nor existed of himself ? What can be more absurd than to suppose such a being to exist ; a being that neither had beginning, or was without beginning—one that is dependent on another, and yet dependent on no one. All these *contradictions*, and many more, are involved in that *strange system* which denies that Christ is a mere created, dependent creature, and yet maintains that He is not the *supreme God*.

2. The Gospel, as a system, can have no existence when the doctrine of *pardon* is rejected. For it declares that 'all have sinned;' that 'we are children of wrath, even as others;' that 'there is none that doeth good,' and that 'judgment has come upon all men, to condemnation.' Now unless this system *provides for pardon*, it necessarily leaves man interminably in this state of guilt, wrath, and condemnation.

As a saving system, therefore, the Gospel can exist no longer than it involves the doctrine of pardon. But this doctrine involves the proper Godhead of Jesus Christ; for we have just shown that there can be no atonement unless he that makes it be supreme; and if we now prove there can be *no forgiveness without an atonement*, we shall have thereby demonstrated that the atoning Messiah is God.

If then sin could be pardoned without *satisfaction by atonement*, it must either be done *according to the law* it has violated, or *in opposition to that law*. If *according to the law*, then the law makes *provision* for its own violation. But this is impossible; for were it so, the law would threaten the offender with death, and at the same time counteract its own operations, by *providing for the offender's escape*. The penalty of violating it would be the blessing of pardon, and not the curse it had threatened: that is, the provision it makes would destroy the *threat* which it utters, and the penalty which it threatens, would annihilate the remedy it proposes. *So this marvellous law would DEVOUR ITSELF*. But if these absurdities are too glaring to allow us to push the principle any farther, let us next inquire whether sin can be pardoned *in opposition to the law* it has broken. If it can, then in pardoning it God must act against His own law. But if He can act against *one* of His laws, He can, for the same reason, act against *all* His laws; and then, by this single conclusion, all the moral perfections of His nature are blotted out for ever.

It must then be impossible to pardon sin, without *satisfaction by atonement*. The doctrine, therefore, of pardon necessarily involves that of our Redeemer's Godhead.

3. The Gospel attributes to Christ *two natures*, one of which is perfectly human, and the other which is supremely Divine.* References

* This doctrine has been rejected because of its *mysteriousness*. That it involves *mystery*, there can be no doubt; otherwise, it would be unlike any other subject to which created minds extend. What is there in the animal, vegetable, or mineral kingdom, which in the *manner* of its being, is not *impenetrably mysterious*? Where has there been a mind so highly gifted, as to *perceive* how gravity acts? how motion is *communicated*? how a vegetable grows, or how his own blood circulates? Though these are objects of his own senses, he can no more perceive how they are, than he can perceive how *three* persons are one Jehovah. Only confound the MANNER how a thing is so, with the FACT that it is so, and there is no one truth in nature, or revelation, but will be wanting evidence to command rational belief. Now it is by *confounding* these two *distinct* things, that this objection against the Godhead of Christ has all its force. A *fact* may be revealed, clear as vision, and yet everlasting ages may not *unfold the reasons* of it. The eternity of Jehovah is an unquestionable fact, but where is there a created mind that can comprehend how He is unbeginning? By close attention it will appear that the *mystery* of our Savior's Divinity originates in the same cause in which every other *mystery* does, viz. the want of capacity in finite minds to grasp the whole. As then our faith has *nothing* to do with the *mystery*, but merely with the *fact* that involves the *mystery*, the *mysteriousness* of a well authenticated fact should never unsettle our faith in the truth of it.

are so numerous made in the New Testament record to natures so *dissimilar* in our Lord's person, that the rejecters of His Divinity have never been able to reconcile them to their system. These scriptures may be ranked in three classes : the first are expressive merely of His *humanity*. 'He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief ;' 'He was an hungered, thirsty, weary ;' of the last judgment no man knoweth the time, 'neither the Son, but the Father ;' 'Then shall the Son also, Himself, be subject to Him that put all things under Him.' Such passages are as clearly *referable to humanity*, as those in the second class are to *Divinity*. 'Adorn the doctrine of God our Savior ;' 'My Lord and my God ;' 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever ;' 'And the Word was God.' These, and the like scriptures, can no more be restricted to the limited import of the former class, than Jehovah can be equalled by a creature. There is a third class of passages, by which is brought to view the *twofold nature* of our Lord. Among these are, 'The Word was made flesh ;' 'Of whom, concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.'

Now if our Lord possessed two natures, it would indeed have been surprising, if *each one* respectively had never been referred to. Had He been merely man, no matter how replete with communicated grace, He could never, without blasphemy, be entitled God. Had He not been man—had His Divinity *absorbed* His manhood, He could not, in truth, be represented as in the first class of quotations. But if these *two natures* remain in Him *unseparated* and yet *distinct*, then these texts, otherwise irreconcilable, most fitly express the two natures of His person.

Some things are certainly true of the human soul, that are not true of the body. We attribute sometimes to the one what we deny to the other ; though we usually speak of them together, as they form but one person. In like manner some things are true of the *manhood* of Christ, which cannot be offered of His *Godhead*. Thus, when our Lord speaks of the poor, He says, 'Me ye have not always with you.' Yet on another occasion He assures His apostles that He would be 'with them *always* : ' and when praying in the audience of His disciples He says, 'Now I am no more in the world ;' and again, 'The Son of man which is in heaven.'

Now all these propositions cannot be true of either His human or Divine nature ; but they are most exactly *true* of His *two natures* respectively. Though He was not *always* here with respect to His human nature, He is always present with His ministers, as to His Godhead. He was not in heaven as to His manhood, but He was there as to His Divine nature. And indeed it would be an easy task to collect a score of texts directly contradictory, were they all applied to *one nature* in Christ. The propositions that He was made lower than the angels, and yet that He was so vastly above them that they were commanded to adore Him ; that He was the son of David, and yet that He was David's Lord ; that He was before Abraham, and yet was not born until the days of Augustus Cesar ; that the earth and the heavens were the work of His hands, and yet these had stood four thousand years before the angel shouted His birth ; that He had glory with the Father before the world was, and yet forty centuries had been

measured out to the world before He was born in Bethlehem. Now such propositions, which might be multiplied indefinitely, can never be made to coincide, if Christ have not *the two natures* Trinitarians ascribe to Him.

So far are these scriptures, then, that make Christ *inferior to the Father*, from opposing His supreme Divinity, that they most exactly fall in *with our views* of the dignity of His person, and can be reconciled with those passages that make Him supreme, on no other ground. The Gospel system insists on these two distinct natures in the great Messiah, to make His death availing. For, while on one hand it denies that the *Divinity* of Christ *suffered*, on the other it imputes all the merits of His *human sufferings* to His *supporting Divinity*. It maintains that the human nature became capable of a degree of suffering, *by its connection* with the unsuffering Divinity, of which no other being in the universe was capable; that by virtue of this connection a value was *communicated* to the sufferings of the humanity, of which God alone can adequately conceive. It is then on the merits of Him who possessed two natures, one in which to suffer, and the other by which to stamp untold worth on the sufferings; it is on the merits of such a sufferer alone, on which the Gospel bases all human hope.

4. The Christian system proposes the *love* and *humility* of Christ, as the great inspiring example for the whole Church, in all ages. The evidence of this proposition stands out on the New Testament record in so bold relief, that formally to prove it would be to insult your understanding. But if Christ be not God, but a mere creature, why are His love and humility so highly *eulogized* in the New Testament. If He be God, the reason is obvious; for then His condescension was astonishing, as His felicity was *full*; by no enterprise in which He could engage, could it be *increased*: therefore, both when He originated and executed the plan of redeeming us, He knew He could gain by this arduous work no *accession* to His happiness. He knew that it had always been infinite, and therefore incapable of increase, and that leaving us unredeemed could, for the same reason, result in no *diminution* of His happiness. The redeeming work must then have been the fruit of the most *amazing love*, on the supposition that the Redeemer was God.

But if He be not God, if He be a *super-angelic Being*, as the Arians believe, or a *mere man*, as Socinians maintain, *self love alone* might have induced Him to undertake what He did for us. For if He were a mere creature, what was His *humility*, or what were His *sufferings* more than those of *many others*, who never received a thousandth part of the reward bestowed on Christ for His sufferings? Did He continue His ministry through three or four years, in the midst of some persecution? So did St. Paul, through nearly *ten times* that period, and perhaps with *ten times* the persecution. Did Christ endure a trial before an unjust judge, with buffetings and scourgings? So did the apostles in *numerous instances*. Did He finally die, after a few hours' agony on the cross? So have the martyrs, after enduring the most studied cruelties through successive days. And why do the inspired writers dwell on the sufferings of Christ, in strains so lofty, if the pangs that have extorted the groans of a *whole creation* deserved not the *name* of sufferings? But what *proportion* do the sufferings of

Christ, as a mere creature, bear to the *reward* which He received for them? As a consequence of His sufferings, He was raised to the place of a *mediator* between Jehovah and the whole race of man—was elevated above all the angels of God, and seated on ‘the right hand of the Majesty on high,’ and acquired the title of Lord, ascribed to Him by every creature in the universe on its bended knees.

Now what are a *few hours’* suffering, compared to all this peerless glory, to which no *created being* can ever attain? Indeed, instead of becoming *poor* for our sakes, as the apostle urges, He became immensely *rich*, by His undertaking for us. Instead of God’s so loving *the world* as to give His Son for it, it would be more appropriate to say that He so loved *His Son* as to honor Him with an appointment to that great enterprise.

For if He be a mere creature, there is no one for whom He died, that reaps a millionth part of the benefit from His death that He does Himself. Can His death, then, be an expression of so much love to *others*, when in it He could but have an eye on ten thousand times more benefit to *Himself*?

If Christ be but a creature, then never let us hear again of His *humbling* Himself in becoming obedient to death; but rather of His exalting Himself by it above any being God had created. If He be not God, let us hear no more of His sufferings for the Church being superlative; for many of His disciples have endured much more for the benefit of religion. If Christ be not God, let us hear no more of His death being an expression of *generous love* to the world, when it procured more for Himself than for the whole universe beside.

Indeed, if Jesus be a mere creature, why is our salvation ascribed to *Him*, rather than to *Paul*, who suffered, and labored vastly more than Christ to procure it? Why is not the love of Paul, rather than the love of Jesus, a theme of boundless praise through earth and heaven? But to conclude. By a retrospective glance at the evidences we have now collected for the support of this truth, we find every thing belonging to Christ, which the Scriptures make peculiar to the self-existent God. Like God He made the worlds, claims them for His own, and will remove them at His pleasure. Like God He pardoned the sins of the guilty, sent forth the eternal Spirit, and wrought in His own name the most stupendous miracles. Like the Supreme Being, He is approached in prayer by the universal Church on earth; He is the object of praise from the redeemed spirits in heaven, and receives unceasing homage from all the angels of God. In His name no less than in that of the Father, the inspired benediction is pronounced, the most sacred oaths are uttered, and the ordinance of baptism is administered. To Christ, as to Jehovah, belong those titles by which alone the ineffable One has made Himself known; titles that He has expressly denied to every other being in the universe; titles for the assumption of which, if He were not God, it was the duty of the Jews to stone Him. Like the infinite God, He claimed the perfections of an eternal nature, so that it could not be robbery to reckon Himself equal with God. The awfully sublime attributes of Almighty power, boundless knowledge, every where pervading presence, and unbeginning existence, belonged to Him. Like God He undertook to dispose of the *claims* of eternal government by atonement, and to open

the way for pardon to a whole world exposed to the unanswered claims of law.

Most certainly, then, the Bible either reveals nothing that God *has done*, or Christ is God. It either informs us of no *name* belonging to Jehovah, or Christ is that Jehovah to whom it belongs. It either speaks of no *attributes* that invest the eternal One, or Christ is He whom they enrobe. It either reveals no *object* of *worship* in the universe, or Christ is that object; and indeed the Bible either speaks of no God *in being*, or Christ is that INFINITE ONE.

Let it also be remembered by those who reject the Redeemer's Divinity, that they thereby reject *the atonement* imputed to Him; all pardon of sin through the atonement, and all regenerating operations of the Divine Spirit on the heart. And then the Gospel is a dead letter, and the ministers of it uncommissioned wanderers.

As then, my brethren, the Divinity of Christ is the key-stone of the Christian system, let us cleave to the doctrine as to the only hope of our lapsed nature, and prepare to join with 'every creature in heaven and on earth,' in supreme ascriptions 'to Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the LAMB for ever and ever.' Amen.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

BY B. F. SHEPARD,

Of the Protestant Episcopal Seminary.

IF every religious opinion which engages the attention of man was judged by its practical importance, how many of those which are the subject of frequent and almost interminable disputes, would sink into forgetfulness. Many of the points which occupied the field of controversy in the middle ages, and to the examination of which were brought profound learning and the acutest logic, are now regarded as not worth contending for, or as too plain to be disputed. Polemics have generally shown themselves most fond of those subjects on which it is impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion—subjects too subtle and abstruse to admit of clear investigation, or conclusive argument. Here argument may be met by argument, and sophistry by sophistry, equally plausible and equally obscure. If they cannot gain a victory, they can at least avoid the appearance of a defeat—if they cannot convince or persuade, they can talk profoundly, (or what often passes for the same thing, unintelligibly,) and wrap themselves up in a mist of scholastic jargon and incomprehensible speculations, which the human mind is prone to admire and applaud. Such were the disputes between the nominalists and realists—that about the perpetual virginity of the blessed virgin—the eternal generation of Christ—the origin of evil, and the consistency of the Divine sovereignty and human free agency. But I need not refer to examples; for they will readily suggest themselves to every one at all acquainted with the course of metaphysical or theological controversy. Had all the labor, learning, and talent, which have been spent upon such points, been employed in efforts to make men wiser and better, the state of the world would have been vastly different from what we now see it.

There are few opinions of more practical importance than that which we have placed at the head of this article ; and yet there are few which are less regarded or more extensively disbelieved. Many of our most numerous and excellent denominations of Christians regard it as dangerous and impious. They do not hesitate to say that it proceeds from pride of superior light and other corrupt passions of the heart, and that those who profess it are on the very brink of ruin. We regret exceedingly that a doctrine which we regard as so precious, should be thus viewed by any portion of our fellow-Christians. But we have too deep a respect for their Christian spirit—for their evangelical and deep-toned piety, and their love for truth, to suspect that they are influenced by any other feelings than love for their Savior and a watchful solicitude for the salvation of souls. It is with the utmost diffidence that we venture to advocate a doctrine which has been rejected by so large a portion of the holiest men that ever lived, and which is now opposed by many whom we highly esteem and love. Even the Church to which we belong, and in whose communion we hope to spend our days laboring for the cause of the Redeemer, almost universally rejects it. But it appears to us of the most consoling character, and of the highest importance to the welfare of Zion.

This doctrine, like many others, has been exposed to much prejudice on account of the errors with which it has frequently been connected. When the doctrine of perfection is mentioned, we are often referred to the brothers and sisters of the Free Spirit in Germany, in the fourteenth century, who, under the guise of holiness or a union with God, threw aside all law, all ordinances, and all restraint, and advocated doctrines and practices as abhorrent to religion as they were to decency and common sense. Antinomianism has sometimes been its attendant, and hence it is inferred that a rejection of the law is a necessary appendage to the doctrine of Christian perfection. And the views that are entertained in this country by those termed Perfectionists, are calculated to foster this prejudice against the doctrine even in its pure and Scriptural form. We hold many of the opinions of this last-named sect in as much abhorrence as any of our brethren. We believe that in some important particulars they are striking at the foundation of the Gospel itself, and that the propagation of their opinions will be followed by most disastrous results. That all Christians are perfect, and that the law is not binding on them, are opinions which those who hold the Scriptural doctrine of perfection will be the first to condemn. If we can only succeed in freeing the doctrine from these objectionable features, and in doing away the prejudices that have consequently arisen, our labor will not be in vain.

Our object now is to consider briefly the nature and proof of the doctrine of Christian perfection. What then are we to understand by this doctrine ?

We will first answer it negatively. It is not perfection in knowledge. This would be omniscience. Knowledge of spiritual things, indeed, will be greatly increased in the perfect Christian ; in the same manner as it is constantly increasing in every Christian as he grows in grace. Just so far as a preparation of heart, and a conformity to the image of God, are requisite to a full comprehension of Divine truth, so far will his knowledge be increased. But the nature of God, and his own soul,

and the works of creation, will still present innumerable difficulties.— On these subjects, and in all departments of human knowledge, he, like every other man, will know only in part. It is a moral, not an intellectual perfection.

Nor will he be exempt from mistakes. Christian perfection does not confer infallibility. Errors of judgment or of ignorance may still occur; but when they are seen, they will immediately be corrected. His *end* will always be good, his *motives* good, and the means by which he pursues his end such as appear to him most wise and just. The Spirit will guide him into all essential truth, and under the influence of that truth he will act. On unimportant points he may commit errors or mistakes; but they will be the result of human weakness and infirmity, and not sin. Infirmities will exist till death is swallowed up in glory. But infirmities are not sins. We cannot here forbear noticing what seems to us a common mistake, and which it is of essential importance to correct. It is the disposition to regard all *errors* as *sins*. In many cases this is virtually taken for granted, when it is professedly denied; and when a Christian is seen falling into imprudences, or erring ever so innocently, it is thought preposterous to suppose that such a one is or can be perfect. Now it should be remembered that nothing is sin, unless it proceed from a bad motive. The motive alone is regarded by God, and whosoever is actuated by pure love to Him will be approved, although a mistaken judgment or incorrect views may lead him into some error in practice. Let it not be thought that I am setting aside conduct as a test of character. I have before said that the perfect Christian will be led by the Spirit into all essential truth. Essential truth operating upon a Christian heart will prevent all essential errors in practice. Whenever these do occur, whatever professions are made, it may be set down as certain that they do not proceed from truth and the Spirit of God. The sincere inquirer after truth and duty, whose heart is filled with love to God, will find the Bible a sufficient guide to preserve him from all sin and from serious mistakes. There is no surer proof of the folly and impiety of the pretensions made by some among us to superior holiness and light, than the very conduct which they claim to be the result of these, but which is utterly at variance with the Spirit and principles of the word of God. To this every pretension, principle, and practice must be brought. Whatever is at variance with it must be wrong. No impulses, no inward light or pretended visions, can alter one of its doctrines or supersede one of its claims. If the doctrine of Christian perfection is not found here, it must at once be rejected. Against this, the experience and feelings of millions should have no weight. Human opinions and feelings are fallible, but the word of God standeth sure. We are more explicit on this point, because those who hold the doctrine of perfection have been accused of undervaluing the Bible.— Some, we admit, have elevated their own feelings above the oracles of God, and have made pretensions to light and purity, just in proportion as they have sunk into the clutches of Satan. Such may have gone out from us, but they are not of us. To us the Bible is the only sure guide of faith and practice. It is the only repository of our hopes—the test of our principles, and the guide of our lives.

Again, Christian perfection does not give exemption from tempta-

tion. Our Savior Himself was tempted, and it would be strange if all His followers were not. The perfect Christian is still a man, possessing the faculties and subject to the feelings of a man. But temptations are not sins ; and every temptation will be resisted as successfully and as sinlessly as those of our Savior.

Nor does Christian perfection imply the highest possible degree of holiness. In this sense the angels in heaven are not perfect, for they are destined to go on increasing in holiness for ever. No being but God is *infinitely* holy. Every being that is not infinitely holy may increase in holiness to all eternity.

What then is Christian perfection ? We answer, It is entire freedom from sin, and supreme love to God. The old man with his affections and lusts has been put off. The carnal mind—the corrupt passions—the hatred to God, have been entirely subdued, and he that was before supremely selfish, sold under sin, now loves God with all his heart, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself. No other object is allowed to share his affections with God. His *whole* heart is His. He loves friends and the brethren ; but his love to them increases instead of diminishing his love to God. In this all his happiness consists, and by this his whole life is directed.

We say that perfection consists in entire freedom from sin and supreme love to God. I do not say that the perfect Christian loves God so much as he is worthy to be loved. He is worthy of infinite love, which no finite being can ever bestow. We are required to love God with all the heart—that is with all *our* heart ; not with the heart or powers of an angel. And when we thus love Him, and our neighbor as ourselves, and act under the influence of this love, we fulfil the royal law, and are perfect in the sense in which we understand perfection.—The perfect Christian loves God to the full extent of his powers, and he is not the less perfect from the fact that his powers will expand, and that he will be able to love Him more hereafter. If it were so, glorified spirits and angels in heaven would not be perfect, for they are constantly progressing in holiness and love to God. They all love God to the full extent of their present powers, and in this their perfection consists. And when the Christian loves God with all his powers he will be perfect, however limited those powers may be. And being actuated by supreme love to God, in all his thoughts, words, and deeds, he will be free from all sin. This is Christian perfection ; and we believe every Christian may and ought to attain it.

We now proceed to the second part of our subject, namely, the proof that Christian perfection may be attained in this life. This may be drawn from the very nature of sin. What is sin but voluntary disobedience to a known law ? The fact that disobedience is voluntary implies that obedience is possible. If the law cannot be obeyed, then it is unjust, and there is no sin in disobeying it ; for where there is no ability there is no obligation. We cannot too strongly reprobate the doctrine, that God imposes upon men commands which He gives them no power to obey. Such a supposition makes God a tyrant and the Bible absurd. If it be said that God is ever ready to grant us His Spirit to enable us to do our duty, then the result is just what we are contending for—we have power to obey the commands of God. It matters little, as to the point in hand, whether this power is within us,

or whether it be an external, superadded influence, supplied by the Spirit of God, of which we may always avail ourselves. In either case a command is given us, and the power of obeying it put within our reach. Our guilt consists in neglecting to use this power. If it be said that the sinner's inability to obey the whole law of God is something which he has brought upon himself, and that the Holy Spirit is granted him as an act of mercy to free him from the consequence of his own sin, then I have nothing to object. But if it be asserted that this inability is antecedent to his own agency—something inherent in the nature of the soul, which man did not produce, and cannot even by the aid of God's Spirit destroy, it will lead to the most dangerous consequences. On this principle, a man when he arrives at an age to distinguish between good and evil, finds himself possessed of certain faculties and powers. A law is given him, which in the exercise of these powers it is utterly impossible for him to obey. Damnation is the consequence of disobedience. This inability he did not create and he cannot remove. Whoever is responsible, *he* is not. Now I ask, Can it be just, that that man should be damned? If so, it must be for not performing impossibilities. If *not*, then God is under *obligation* to grant him His Spirit to enable him to obey His commands. This makes the gift of the Spirit an act of *debt* and not of *grace*. And in this case our position still remains good—man will have the power to do his duty and keep the law.*

The distinction will here be made between natural and moral ability, and with reason. This difference, it seems to us, is much greater than is generally supposed; so great indeed that it would be altogether improper to express the two ideas by the same term, did not the want of better language require it. As it is, the expressions moral inability and moral necessity almost always express wrong ideas. A moral inability is in reality no *inability* at all—it is simply *unwillingness*. And when we say a man is morally unable to obey a command of God, we mean simply that he is *unwilling* to obey a command which he has full power to obey. That men are in this sense unable, that is, unwilling to fulfil the requirement of God, we freely admit, and for this reason the Holy Spirit is granted to overcome their unwillingness and constrain them to repent and serve God. This is the view presented throughout the Bible: God gave man a law, and commanded him to obey it. Nothing is said about his ability to comply—it is taken for granted, and every transgression receives its just recompense of reward. Man's only inability then to serve God consists in an unwillingness to do what he knows he can and ought to do. When the sinner is converted this unwillingness is at an end; the corrupt fountain of the heart from which it proceeded, is broken up; self love is subdued and

* We do not exactly agree with our author in the above paragraph. Through the inability brought on us by the original apostacy, we are unable of ourselves to do what God requires, that is, to love God with all the heart:—hence the necessity of conversion. For if we were able to love God in our natural state, the necessity of conversion would be superseded; but our Savior has said, 'Except ye be converted, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Neither can a sinner repent and believe in Jesus Christ, only as he is assisted by the Holy Spirit. But as the Holy Spirit is given to all men in the day of their merciful visitation, and every means afforded them for working out their salvation, therefore it is perfectly proper to say to all, Ye have power to do whatever God requires at your hands.—Ed.

the love of God implanted, and becomes henceforth the predominant feeling of the heart. When it becomes supreme and fills the whole soul, then he is a perfect Christian. If the *sinner* can obey the command of God, much more the *Christian*, for he has acquired great moral power by his repentance and conversion. With him the great obstacle has been overcome—the rebellious heart. It is therefore far more probable that the Christian will become perfect, than that the sinner will become a Christian.

But let us proceed to more direct Scriptural proof. Time will by no means allow us to select all the passages that support the doctrine in question. We shall notice only a few of the more obvious.

If a command implies duty, and duty supposes ability, either inherent or conferred, to perform it, then the attainability of perfection may be easily proved from the words of our Savior, Matt. xxii, 37–39, ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself.’ Here is a plain command, and full obedience to it constitutes Christian perfection, as we have before shown. The command itself is very clear; there is no obscurity either in the words or the idea. It simply requires that we should love God supremely; that is, to the full extent of our present powers, and our neighbor as ourselves. The only question is, Can these commands be obeyed? Can the *Christian* obey them? for of him alone are we to speak. Can he, in the exercise of all the powers which God has given him, and by the aid of the Holy Spirit, which all who ask will receive, obey these commands, on which hang all the law and the prophets? If he can, then our position is sustained—perfection is attainable. If he cannot, then one of two things will follow; either it is not his duty to obey these first commands of God, or it is his duty to perform impossibilities; for by the supposition obedience to these commands is an impossibility. We leave those who take this ground to settle the controversy between themselves and God.

Again, Matt. v, 48, ‘Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.’ This is a part of our Savior’s inimitable sermon on the mount. It seems to be the sum of a variety of instructions, which He had been giving to His disciples. As if wearied with naming particulars, He sums up their whole duty in this, ‘Be ye therefore perfect,’ &c. What does this injunction mean? Few, I suppose will deny, that it relates to the moral character, not to the intellectual; and therefore cannot mean ‘be ye fully instructed in doctrine and duty,’ as some have supposed. For to be ‘fully instructed in doctrine and duty as God is fully instructed in doctrine and duty,’ is nothing less than omniscience. It cannot mean simply ‘be ye Christians,’ for then every Christian has complied with the full injunction of Christ, however small may be his spiritual attainments. Beside, simply to be Christians, while they are constantly sinning, as many contend that Christians are, is very far from being perfect as God is perfect. On the other hand, no one will pretend that it teaches a perfection of degrees, as it is called, or that it requires men to be holy or perfect in the same degree in which God is perfect, for with finite beings this is impossible. God is infinitely holy. It seems evidently to require unmingled holiness. Be ye holy as God is holy, according to the extent of your powers.

Another passage is found Col. iv, 12, 'Epaphras—saluteth you, always laboring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.' Here is the prayer of a saint, of which the apostle evidently approves. It is of course a reasonable prayer, and one to which he might reasonably expect an answer. He prays that the Christians at Collosse might stand *perfect* and *complete* in all the will of God; or in other words, that they might be perfectly and completely conformed to the whole will of God. Now what was the whole will of God in regard to them? Certainly not that they should continue to sin and give Him a divided heart. But that they should forsake all sin, and love Him with their whole heart. The original words rendered perfect and complete are very expressive. The former, τέλειος means perfect, complete. The verb from which it is derived means, to perfect—to make perfect—to complete. The other word, πεπληρωμένοι, is the passive participle of the verb πληρωω, to fulfil—to perform fully—to complete—to perfect. In the passive, to be fully completed, or entirely conformed to, as in the passage before us. It can mean nothing less than complete conformity to the whole will of God; and this is nothing less than perfection.

There is another class of texts, in which a different word occurs in the original. This is καθαρίζω, (from καθαρός, pure,) to cleanse, to purify either from external impurities, or legally, or spiritually. The first passage we shall quote is 1 John i, 7-10, 'But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Christ His Son *cleanseth us from all sin*. If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and *to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*. If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and the truth is not in us.' The meaning of the phrases 'cleanseth us from all sin,' and 'to cleanse from all unrighteousness,' is obvious. They imply an entire freedom from all sin. This is their literal import. And if the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, it will give us sinless perfection. It may be said that the 8th verse shows that we cannot be free from all sin: 'If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' But the 8th verse is explained by the 10th: 'If we say we *have not sinned* we make Him a liar,' &c. The phrase, 'If we say we *have no sin*,' of the 8th verse, is of the same import with that in the 10th, 'If we say we *have not sinned*.' The meaning of both is, if we say we are not sinners, and therefore have no need of the blood of Christ to cleanse us from our sins, then we deceive ourselves. The 8th and 10th verses refer to the state in which men are by nature, previous to the operation of Divine grace upon the heart, and not to that in which they must necessarily remain after it has operated. If any one say, that the expression 'the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin,' refers not to what takes place in this life, but to what will take place in a future life, he gives it an explanation which the context will by no means bear. The two expressions in the 7th verse, 'If we walk in the light,' and 'The blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin,' evidently refer to the same period of time. When ye walk in the light as He is in the light, then the blood of Christ will cleanse you from all sin. That the first clause of this verse 'If ye walk in the light,' refers to their walking in this life,

no one will deny. That the first consequence of this walking in the light, viz. 'Ye have fellowship one with another,' also occurs in this life will not be denied—and it is equally undeniable, that the second consequence, viz. the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, will occur during the same period.

There is another text peculiarly strong, 2 Cor. vii, 1, 'Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us *cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit*, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.' 'All filthiness of the flesh and spirit,' includes all sins of every kind, and to be cleansed from all sins of every kind is to be entirely free from sin, or to attain sinless perfection. The expression 'perfecting holiness' proves two things. 1. That there may be holiness in the heart, which is not perfect or complete, and therefore overturns the opinion of those who hold that every Christian is perfect. For the text was addressed to Christians, and if they were already *perfect* in holiness, there would be no propriety in exhorting them to *make* their holiness perfect. 2. It shows that perfect holiness may be obtained; for it would be idle to exhort men to obtain or to seek that which is known to be unattainable. The verb of which perfecting is a participle means, to finish—to complete—to perfect. Now holiness cannot be finished—completed—perfected, while there is any unholiness remaining. The conclusion is unavoidable.

Again, 1 Thess. v, 23, 'And the very God of peace *sanctify you wholly*, and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.' Here is a prayer of the apostle, and if it be not a prayer that the Thessalonian Christians might be *perfectly holy* before death, (which is meant by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,) I am utterly at a loss to know what it does mean, or what language can express such an idea. Is it said that this is merely the expression of a wish on the part of the apostle, without implying that the thing desired was attainable? Bating the absurdity or the profanity of the idea, that the apostle would pray for what he knew could not be obtained, the very next verse proves the incorrectness of such a supposition. For he adds, 'Faithful is He that calleth you, who *also will do it*.' Will do what? Certainly what the apostle had just prayed for, viz. *sanctify them wholly*, and preserve them blameless unto death. I see no possible way of evading this argument. He prays for their perfect sanctification in this life, and then says it will be done.

Henry's comment on this passage is worthy of a passing notice.—It is as follows: 'The things prayed for on the part of the Thessalonians are their sanctification—that God *would sanctify them wholly*, and their preservation, *that they might be preserved blameless*. He prays that they might be *wholly* sanctified; that the *whole man* might be *sanctified*; and then that the whole man, spirit, soul, and body might be preserved: or he prays that they might be *wholly* sanctified, more perfectly, for the best are sanctified but in part while in this world, and therefore we should pray for and press toward complete sanctification.' Now I would fain ask by what rule of interpretation Mr. Henry makes *wholly sanctified*, the *whole man sanctified*, which he four times repeats as the amount of the apostle's prayer, mean merely sanctified more perfectly, or sanctified only in part, which he says is all that the best

can attain while in this world. And still more remarkable does this appear, when immediately after he speaks of the apostle's 'comfortable assurance that God would hear his prayer.' Faithful is He who calleth you, who also will do it. Now what was the apostle's prayer. Henry has said four times that it was that they might be *wholly sanctified*; and here he says that he had a 'comfortable assurance that God would hear his prayer,' which the apostle directly asserts in verse 24. How is this consistent with the assertion that the best are sanctified but in part while in this world? And he says again, 'Therefore the apostle assures them that God would do what he (the apostle) desired.'—Whether this assurance amounted to a full certainty that they would be wholly sanctified in this life, or not, is of no consequence to our argument. It is certainly inconsistent with a knowledge or even a belief that they *could not* be wholly sanctified. To make this matter perfectly clear, we will state these propositions together.

1. The apostle prays that God would *wholly sanctify* the Thessalonian Christians. (See verse 23 and Henry's comment.)

2. He has 'comfortable assurance' that God would hear his prayer. (See verse 24 and Henry's comment.)

3. The conclusion according to Henry is, the *best are sanctified but in part* while in this world. Whether it be legitimate or not I leave others to judge.

Should it be objected that this reasoning would prove that all the Thessalonian Christians must have become perfect, which is highly improbable, I reply, 1. There is no such improbability in the case as will justify us in rejecting the plain sense of the apostle's words. And 2. Though he prays that they might be sanctified wholly, and has comfortable assurance that God will hear his prayer, yet it is obviously implied, if they will obey his injunctions and do their duty.

Again, 1 John ii, 5, 6, 'Whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby we know that we are in Him. He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked.' If the love of God is *perfected*, then there must be *perfect* love. Perfect love excludes sin, and these two points constitute perfection. The 6th verse is equally strong. 'He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also to walk even as He (Christ) walked.' Now how did Christ walk? Surely in perfect holiness, and no one can walk as He walked who does not live perfectly holy. *Ought* implies obligation; obligation supposes power to meet it. What a man ought to do he is guilty for-not doing; but it is a palpable absurdity to suppose that a man is guilty for not doing that which he has no power to do.

Another argument is founded on one of the petitions in our Lord's prayer. 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' How is God's will done in heaven? He is perfectly loved and perfectly obeyed. This is what He wishes of all His creatures. How then must it be done on earth, in order that this petition may be answered? Why He must here be perfectly loved and perfectly obeyed by every individual. In no other way can His will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Here then is a prayer given us by our Savior for *universal perfection* which many Christians are in the daily habit of using. In regard to it one of three things must be admitted.

1. It must be a prayer which may be offered in faith, and which consequently may be answered ; and if so, perfection is attainable : or,

2. Our Savior intended by it to lead his disciples to believe what is not true, and to pray for that which He never intended to grant : or,

3. He intended they should offer a prayer which they did not believe, and to which they had no expectation of an answer. Which of these propositions is true, no one can long hesitate to determine.

But I have here an additional remark. Many of our opponents hold a belief in the doctrine of perfection to be a sin. At least *one** ecclesiastical body of our land has condemned it, as among the prominent heresies of the day. Here then comes a new difficulty. We are commanded by our Savior to pray for a certain object, and yet we are told that it is a sin to believe that object can be obtained. Can persons with such opinions offer such a prayer ?

There is another class of passages, in which the verb *καταρτίζω* and its derivatives occur, which bears upon this doctrine. 'The proper original sense of the word is to compact or knit together either members in a body, or parts in a building.' (See Leigh in Parkhurst.) It thence comes to mean to perfect, to finish, to complete. Dr. Clarke, in his note on 2 Cor. xiii, 9, 'And this we wish, even *your* perfection,' has these remarks : 'The perfection or rejoicing which the apostle here wishes, is that which he refers to the state of the Church in its fellowship, unity, order, &c. And perfection in the soul is the same in reference to it, as perfection in the Church is to its order and unity. The perfection or rejoicing of the soul implies its purification, and placing of every faculty, passion, and appetite in its proper place ; so that the original order, harmony, and purity of the soul may be restored, and the whole builded up to be a habitation of God through the Spirit.'

We shall give but two passages where the word occurs. Heb. xiii, 20, 21, 'Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, *make you perfect in every good work to do His will*, working in you that which is *well pleasing in His sight* through Jesus Christ.' The other passage is 1 Peter v, 10, 'But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered awhile, make you *perfect*, establish, strengthen, settle you.'

Comment on these passages is hardly necessary. I know of no language that can more strongly express Christian perfection than that in the one first quoted. '*Make you perfect in every good work to do His will*,' &c. They are to be made *perfect* in every good work which God will have them do ; God Himself working in them that which is *well pleasing* in His sight ; which of course cannot be sin, or in any way mingled with sin.

We must here add a few words on the propriety of praying for that which we believe to be unattainable. Prayer to be acceptable must be offered in faith ; not indeed with that full assurance which is included in the highest sense of that word, and which enables us to feel certain that our particular request will be granted. But we must believe that the thing for which we pray is possible and agreeable to the will of God, and we must have some ground to hope that our prayer will be

* Synod of S. C., in a paper entitled 'Substitute for the Act and Testimony.'

heard and answered. For example, a Christian prays for an impenitent friend. He knows not the arrangements of God in regard to that individual, or what will be his destiny. But he does know that it is the will of God that sinners should repent, and he has some ground of hope in this particular case. But should this friend die impenitent, giving the clearest evidence that he was lost, then he would feel that it was wrong to pray for him because he could have no hope, and consequently no faith, since it would appear manifestly contrary to the will and purpose of God to answer his prayer. Now could he previous to the death of that friend obtain evidence that he was given up of God to impenitence and final destruction—evidence that left no shadow of doubt, would it not be equally wrong to pray for him as in the former case? Every one sees that it would; and why? Because he believes it contrary to the will of God to grant his prayer. Now suppose on the other hand we are commanded to pray for a specified object—the conversion of the world for instance—would any one doubt that such an object could be accomplished, or that there was reasonable ground to hope that it would be accomplished? And is not the conclusion equally clear in regard to that petition of the Lord's prayer which we have already noticed, 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' or the prayer of Paul, 'The God of peace sanctify you wholly,' as it is in regard to the conversion of the world? And how God's will can be done on earth as it is in heaven, while all men, Christians as well as sinners, are continually sinning against Him and violating His will, I am unable to see. But on the principle of those who oppose the doctrine of perfection, we must not only pray oftentimes *without* faith, but *against* faith; we must pray for that which our creed requires us to disbelieve and regard as a heresy and a sin. Can this be right?

But what do Christians and Christian ministers in particular teach on this subject? Do they not exhort men to do *all* their duty—to avoid *all* sin, and love God with all their heart, mind, and strength? And if they see a brother offend, do they not feel bound to reprove him? Supposing that brother should urge in excuse what he had often heard his preacher advance—

'Why I am imperfect; I cannot be free from all sin; I cannot do all my duty; you must excuse some delinquencies.'

What would be the reply?

Methinks it would be—'You have *no* excuse for sin; you *can* do your duty; God commands you to love Him supremely, and you are guilty if you do not obey.'

'What!' replies the brother, 'are you a perfectionist?'

'O no; I mean'—(what does he mean?) 'I mean—you must strive to avoid all sin, and to do all your duty, though it is presumption to expect you can ever accomplish it here.'

'But after I have done the utmost that I can with the help of God, and fail in some points, am I still guilty?'

'O sir, after we have done all, we are unprofitable servants.'

'To be sure; but does *unprofitable* imply *guilt*? Your servant may become unprofitable through sickness; but is he *guilty* for being sick?'

'O sir, I see you are falling into the common error of measuring your duty by your ability.'

'Will you have the goodness, sir, to point out to me a *duty* which I cannot perform, and tell me upon what principle it is a duty?'

'You are commanded to love God with all your heart, and your neighbor as yourself; yet 'tis presumption to think you can do it.'

'This is singular. You have just reproved me for not keeping this commandment, and now you tell me that it is presumption to think I can keep it. If I *can* keep it, it is not presumption to think I can; if I *cannot*, why do you reprove me? But will you tell me, sir, how much of it I may expect to keep without being guilty of presumption?'

We might go on with this dialogue, and we believe our anti-perfection teacher would find himself involved in a variety of difficulties. It is impossible in regard to most minds to separate the idea of the impossibility of avoiding all sin, from that of justification in the commission of some sin. We know it is absurd to speak of being justified in the commission of sin, yet it is an absurdity to which the doctrine we are opposing almost necessarily leads. It becomes our opponents to relieve us from the embarrassment in which their principle involves us. According to them we sin in aiming too high, and we sin in aiming too low; it is presumption to expect too much, and it is want of faith to expect too little. *How much* then of our duty may we expect to perform, and be guiltless both of presumption and of neglect? Supposing that when our Savior repeated those commands on which hang all the law and the prophets, some by-stander had said to Him, 'Master, we know that your commands are just and holy, but I cannot obey them; 'tis presumption to think so,'—what would have been His reply?

But it may be said that though any one individual sin may be avoided, yet the whole series and for a course of years cannot. I recollect a remark of Coleridge to the same point. He advanced the objection, and brought forward an illustration to support it. I cannot now turn to the passage, neither do I precisely recollect the illustration, but I will give one somewhat like it and which will answer the same purpose. A blind man attempts to walk a narrow path between two precipices; he proceeds a few steps in safety; but it does not follow that he can continue for miles without deviating. No more, infers the philosopher, can the Christian refrain from sin all his life, though he may for a short time. True, but supposing the blind man were told that if he would make the effort and do the best he could, a friendly hand should be outstretched to direct and guide his steps with unerring accuracy, then, I say he would be able, and if commanded to do it, he would be guilty if he did not comply. So the Christian, though he cannot by his own strength merely walk the road of holiness, unscathed by sin, yet if he will put on the whole armor of God, and lean upon the Divine arm that is held out to him, he may, and blessed be God for the help.

We now proceed to some objections that may be urged against the views we are maintaining. We have already noticed some of the more formidable in our statement of the doctrine; but there are others which demand a brief notice.

The first is drawn from such passages of Scripture as these: 'There is no man that sinneth not,' 1 Kings viii, 46. 'For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not,' Eccl. vii, 20. Our own opinion in regard to these verses is, that they simply teach that no man passes through life without committing sin—not that every man must sin in every period of his life. They may have a potential sense, 'For there is no man that *may* not sin.' It would not be difficult to

show that the original words will bear this meaning, and the supposition which precedes the first of these texts seems to require it. *If* they sin against thee, (for there is no man that sinneth not.) *If* implies *contingency*, which is inconsistent with the *certainly* supposed to be contained in the parenthetic clause. *Should* they sin against thee, for perhaps every man will, &c. This makes it all consistent, though we prefer our first interpretation.

Examples from Scripture are often referred to for the same purpose. David sinned, and so did Peter. Granted, and what follows? Not that *they* even continued to sin all their lives, much less that all Christians will do so. We do not deny that Christians *may* sin; eminently holy men often have sinned, and a vast majority of the true followers of Christ are sanctified but in part. But it by no means follows that none can or do attain sinless perfection. If the examples of Scripture in which good men have fallen were ten times more numerous than they are, it would only prove what we do not deny, that the saints of God *may* have their sins.

But it is said this doctrine fosters spiritual pride, and lulls the soul into a deceitful security. I state the objection as I find it; I am not sure that I understand it. If it mean that the *belief* of the doctrine fosters spiritual pride, I think it evidently unfounded. For if the Christian believes that he can attain this perfection, he must believe that he *ought* to attain it; for every Christian knows that he should make the highest possible attainment in holiness. If then he believes he can be free from all sin, and yet feels that he is still cherishing sin in his heart, it will fill him with shame and humiliation rather than with pride. As soon should we expect that the voluptuary would be proud because he believes he can reform, or the sinner because he believes he can be a Christian, as that the Christian should be, because he believes he can be perfect. But if the objection refers to those who claim *to be* perfect, the question arises, Are their claims well founded? *be* they perfect or *be* they not? If they are not, I grant as readily as the objector that these pretensions, whether the persons are deceivers or self-deceived, will foster pride and lead into sin. But with such persons we have nothing to do. This very pride proves infallibly that they are not perfect. But the fact that there are hypocritical pretenders to perfection is no more objection to the doctrine itself, than the fact that there are hypocritical pretenders to piety is an objection to the common doctrine of experimental religion. While we preach that sinners should repent and be converted and lead holy lives, there will be some that make pretensions to godliness who are, and who know themselves to be, yet in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity. And there will be others who imagine that they are serving God, while they are yet entangled in the meshes of Satan. But he would be thought a singular reasoner, who should hence pretend that it was dangerous to advocate the doctrine of experimental religion.— True piety in its lowest state is a foe to pride of every kind; much more so when it reaches perfection. What is pride but the offspring of a sinful heart? It is one of the elements of our *fallen* nature. Just in proportion as we put off the old man, subdue the carnal mind, and restore the lost image of God to the soul, will pride disappear. He who has made the greatest progress in holiness

will have the least pride, and he who is perfectly holy will be perfectly humble. He that is free from all sin is of course free from pride.

But it is asked, If perfection is attainable, why are there none who are perfect? On this question we shall make several remarks. In the first place, it takes for granted what we deny, viz. that none have reached perfection. There are those who say they are free from sin, and whose deep humility, godly lives, and self-denying labors in the cause of their Redeemer, leave no reason to doubt the truth of their pretensions. But these, it is said, are interested persons; they wish to support their doctrine, and therefore are not impartial witnesses. Just the same objection is brought against the witnesses of our Savior's miracles and resurrection. 'These,' says the infidel, 'are Christians; they are interested persons—party concerned; they wish to support their doctrine, and therefore are not competent witnesses. Let those who are free from this bias—who are not Christians, testify to the miracles, and I will believe.' Who does not see that this is impossible? The mind that admits the miracle admits the religion; and the very fact that he testifies to the resurrection of Christ, disqualifies him in the view of the infidel for being a competent witness. So in the case before us, an example is demanded of one who has attained perfect holiness. Examples are produced. 'These,' 'tis said, 'are dreaming fanatics; they believe the doctrine and wish to support it, therefore they are incompetent witnesses. Give us one who is not a perfectionist, and we ask no more.' Who does not see that this request is absurd. For one who denies that perfection can be attained, will not, of course, pretend that he has obtained it, and therefore can be no witness in the case. I repeat, therefore, there are those who claim to be perfect, and whose lives do not give the lie to their pretensions. These I offer as witnesses, and their testimony must stand as true, till it is proved to be false.

And these witnesses may be much more numerous than we suppose. Christian perfection is not a quality that will make a display in the world. It will not be proclaimed upon the house tops or at the corners of the streets. On the contrary, he that has reached it is perfectly humble, and seeks not the notice or applause of the world. His whole object is to do his duty to God and his fellow men, and to wait in joyful expectation for the coming of his Lord, and I doubt not but on that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, many a Christian who was unknown or despised in the world, will be found to have lived even here without stain and without spot, the perfect image of his Lord.

But that the number of such is small, compared with the whole number of Christians, I do not doubt. It is a melancholy fact, but no more so than another fact, that even in Christian lands a great majority of those for whom Christ died, and who believe in the importance of a change of heart, live without God and without hope in the world.—Owing to the wickedness of the heart and the wiles of the adversary, few comparatively even of good men reach this state of perfection, till death is swallowed up in glory. There are two other reasons why so few become perfect. One is, few believe the doctrine. We cannot expect to see it exemplified till it is believed. The other is, most persons entertain wrong views of it. They suppose it implies something superhuman, and therefore are deterred from efforts to reach it, which they would make, were their views correct. But man is not required

to exercise the powers of an angel, or to possess the same degree of holiness as an angel, any more than he is required to know as much as an angel. As to the probability that any will reach this state, we can only say, if our views are correct, Christians can and ought to be perfect; they also have a prevailing desire to be perfect. Is it not probable that some of them will be perfect?

Thus have we endeavored to explain the doctrine of perfection, and present some of the more prominent Scriptural proofs. If we have done any thing to free it from objections and exhibit it in its true light, we shall be abundantly rewarded for our labor.

ON PREPARATION TO MEET GOD.

A SERMON BY THE REV. H. W. HILLIARD, A. M.,

Of the Alabama Conference.

‘Prepare to meet thy God,’ Amos iv, 12.

To comprehend the full force and spirit of this passage, we must examine those parts of the chapter with which it is immediately connected. It will be observed that the idolatry of the Israelites is severely rebuked; they are reminded of the terrible judgments which had been inflicted on them, and of their own singular incorrigibleness.

‘And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. And also I have withholden the rain from you when there were yet three months to the harvest: and I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city; one piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not withered. So two or three cities wandered unto one city to drink water, but they were not satisfied: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have smitten you with blasting and mildew: when your gardens, and your vineyards, and your fig trees, and your olive trees increased, the palmer worm devoured them: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt: your young men have I slain with the sword, and have taken away your horses; and I have made the stink of your camps to come up unto your nostrils: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have overthrown some of you as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning; yet have ye not returned unto me saith the Lord. Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel: and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. For lo, He that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, the Lord, the God of hosts is His name.’

There are two prominent thoughts suggested by this sublime controversy between God and His people. First, that the judgments of God are not vindictive, but that men by persisting in a course of transgression make it necessary that they should be punished.

Very unworthy conceptions of the character of God are sometimes entertained. There are many who take but a partial view of His ad-

ministration, and blind to the extended benevolence which characterizes it they condemn it as severe. They point to the expulsion from paradise, the deluge, the destruction of cities, the overthrow of nations, and other instances of the signal punishment of sin, as illustrations of their view. They look to the punishment, but they forget its philosophy.

God is benevolent : no truth can be clearer. The heavens above us declare it, and the earth beneath our feet teaches it. It is illustrated in that wide regard which embraces the universe in all its amplitude, diffusing life and preserving harmony throughout the worlds ; and in that concern which we daily witness for the preservation of the humblest creatures that exist. Our Lord employed the sparrow and the lily as illustrations of this feature in the Divine character. In the sacred writings power is ascribed to God, and wisdom, and other qualities ; but St. John declares that '*God is love.*'

When then in viewing the Divine administration we discover instances of punishment and suffering, we must account for them upon some other principle, than to suppose that they result from a disposition in God to create unhappiness. The great tendency of the administration must be looked to ; the relation which the beings who suffer sustain to others must be regarded.

That this view may be made clearer, let us examine some circumstances in the history of mankind which will serve to illustrate and enforce it. The history of the plagues which were sent on Egypt, is thought by some to furnish a very strong argument against the mercy of the Divine administration. We think that its testimony is of a directly opposite character. To appreciate these events properly, we must regard the moral and religious condition of Egypt at the time when they occurred. Idolatry of the grossest kind prevailed. It is said by an author, whom we shall call to our aid in remarking upon the miracles which were performed by Moses among the Egyptians, that though idolatry took its rise in Chaldea, '*Egypt seems to have become at a very early period tinctured with that vice, while in the extent to which they carried it, all ancient writers allow that no people can be brought into comparison with the Egyptians. That brute worship originated in Egypt, can we think be as little doubted, as that it gradually arose out of the use of hieroglyphical writing, and at all events we know that it was practised there to a degree in itself irreconcilable with common reason.*'

Now it seems to us, that under these circumstances the introduction into Egypt of the Israelites, a people acquainted with the true God, must be recognized as a very favorable event for the Egyptians.—When it became necessary to remove the Israelites from the land of their bondage and degradation, the means employed to bring about this result were manifestly designed to benefit their oppressors by exposing the folly of their idolatry.

The first plague to which God condemned Egypt to submit, was the conversion of the waters into blood. This strange effect was produced by an instrumentality well calculated to lead them to a knowledge of God. Moses His servant barely smote the river with his rod.—This very remarkable circumstance would have astonished any people, but it had a special application to the condition of Egypt. The Nile, which gave fertility to their lands, was considered by the Egyptians a

god ; and yet it is ' converted at the command of a servant of Jehovah into a substance which none of their priests could touch or even approach without pollution.'

The plague of the frogs succeeded this, another unavoidable source of pollution.

Then came the plague of the lice, and they were upon every man and beast throughout the land. ' Now if it is remembered that no man could approach the altars of Egypt on whom so impure an insect harbored, and that the priests to guard against the slightest risk of contamination wore only linen garments, and shaved their heads and bodies every day, the severity of this miracle as a judgment upon Egyptian idolatry may be imagined.'

While it lasted no act of worship could be performed, and so keenly was this felt, that the very magicians exclaimed, ' This is the finger of God.'

The same principle is traced in the fourth plague, of which one of their deities was made the instrument. Swarms of flies came upon all the land.

The fifth plague it is said struck at the root of the system of brute worship. It was the murrain among the cattle : ' Neither Osiris, nor Isis, nor Ammon, nor Pan, possessed power to save his representative ; and the sacred bull, and ram, and heifer, and he-goat were swept away by the same malady which destroyed others.'

It is believed that the sixth plague was intended to rebuke the practice of offering human sacrifices. This was done to propitiate Typhon, or the evil principle. There are reasons for believing that these victims were selected from the Israelites. Moses, by the direction of Jehovah, approached the furnace where the victims were burned, and imitating the manner of the Egyptian priests, took a handful of the ashes, and casting them into the air, there came instead of a blessing boils and blains, peculiarly obnoxious upon all the people of the land. The inability of Typhon to protect his worshippers was thus shown.

In the seventh plague it is said that Isis the god of water, and Osiris the god of fire, were the instruments. Lightning and hail came with tremendous power upon the land, and the horror of the Egyptians may be imagined, when we remember ' that Egypt is blessed with a sky uncommonly serene, that in the greatest part of it no rain falls from one end of the year to the other, and that even in such districts as are watered from on high, a slight and transient shower is all that the inhabitants ever witness.'

The eighth plague was that of the locusts, and while in itself a serious evil, it demonstrated the inability of the gods Isis and Serapis to protect the land from their invasion.

In the language of the writer whose course we have mainly followed in viewing these miracles, ' The ninth plague was directed against that species of superstition, which, as it first broke in upon true religion, so it seems to have held throughout the highest place in the estimation of the heathen. Light, that great god of Chaldea, was shown to be a mere creature in the hands of the Most High, and both the sun and the moon were veiled during three days and nights from the eyes of their astonished worshippers.'

' The tenth and most tremendous judgment of all was, as indeed it

is represented to be, a perfect application of the law of reprisal to the stubborn and rebellious Egyptians. "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born. Let my son go that he may serve me, and if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." Before this threat was carried into execution, every effort had been made to subdue the obstinacy of Pharaoh. Judgment after judgment had been sent upon him and his subjects, by none of which were the children of Israel affected. His gods were shown to be no gods—his sacred river was made the source of defilement to him. The sun refused him its light, the locusts devoured his crops, yet none of all these things succeeded in convincing Pharaoh that Jehovah was supreme throughout the universe, and that it was his wisdom to obey. Then, and not till then, God raised his arm to strike, and the strength and the pride of Egypt perished in one night.'

In this whole controversy we think that the mercy of God was largely displayed.

The history of the Israelites will furnish farther illustrations of our view. It is well known that they were very early distinguished as the people of God, and were peculiarly blessed. The manifestations of the Divine regard for them were such as to attract the observation of other nations. By a direct and most remarkable display of power God delivered them from bondage; the waters retired at their approach and left them a sure passage for their hosts, and then overwhelmed their pursuers; a heavenly banner waved over them by day and by night, and guided them on their way; for them water gushed out of the rock, and food became abundant in the wilderness. In the red path of battle they were shielded, and the strength of nations was subdued before them. They enjoyed a glorious intercourse with the Almighty. His presence was with them, and His voice was heard in their midst; its still, clear tones proclaiming His loving kindness.

Now glance at the future history of this people. See them overtaken by calamities, visited with famine, the fertility of their lands destroyed, their beautiful places desolate, thousands sinking under the breath of pestilence, their young men slain with the sword, their strength in war vanquished, and their glory spoiled; hear them sighing in captivity, see them sitting in sadness upon the banks of strange rivers, far from their home and their temple; survey all the scenes of their wonderful history, and then ask, 'What has done all this?' Here is the arm of the Lord made bare against a people who were once cherished. Can it be imagined that the administration of the Almighty is capricious? This mighty change in the condition of the Israelites is to be accounted for upon principles very clear and equitable. It was the result of their own transgressions; the effect of that discipline which it is necessary for moral purposes, should be extended over all. Moses, the illustrious legislator of the Israelites, clearly predicted the sufferings of this people, and attributed them solely to their abandonment of duty. He represented to them how necessary it would be to punish rebellion, and while he promised as the reward of obedience, the largest blessings, he assured his people that their sins must bring upon them distressing calamities. What a melancholy sanction has history given to all that he uttered!

Why did the Israelites suffer from famine? That they might see

their folly in departing from the Lord, and return unto Him. This is to be learned from the 6th verse of the chapter from which we have selected our subject : ‘ And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places, *yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord.*’ Had the object been accomplished, their calamities would have been arrested. Their fields would have smiled again, and put on their beauty afresh ; they would have been blessed with plenty ; their gardens, and vineyards, and fig trees, and olive trees would have been safe from the palmer worm ; they would have been strangers to the pestilence after the manner of Egypt ; their young men would have escaped the sword ; their strength in battle would have remained undiminished ; their country would not have been desolate.

Many other examples might be furnished which clearly exhibit the principle which we have said characterizes the Divine administration. We shall present one more—Nebuchadnezzar, the great king of Babylon. His vast possessions, his immense power, and the splendor which every where met his glance, had well nigh made him forget that there was a greater being than himself. His greatness is said to have reached unto heaven, and his dominion to the ends of the earth.—Kings were his vassals and tributaries. Egypt, Syria, Phœnicia, Arabia, swelled his wealth. He was a conqueror ; the strength of his arms was acknowledged on the shores of the Euxine and Caspian seas, and to the Atlantic ocean.

Babylon ‘the glory of kingdoms,’ the city of palaces ; Babylon, with its gates of brass, its magnificent temples, its hanging gardens—Babylon was his. His own grandeur and the fate which awaited him were pictured to him in a dream. He seeks an interpreter. The prophet of the Lord unfolds the vision, and urges him to break off his sins by righteousness, and his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor. But power, pomp, wealth, splendor, intoxicated him. He looked forth upon the glory of his kingdom, and he was dazzled. He walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon, he looked upon its beautiful architecture fashioned by his own taste ; the city in its glorious splendor was at his feet, and as he gazed upon it, and the voices of the thousands who owned his sway broke upon his ear, his heart swelled with a lofty pride, and he exclaimed, ‘ Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power and for the honor of my majesty ?’ In that very hour an unearthly voice fell upon the ear of the king of Babylon, saying, ‘ The kingdom is departed from thee.’ He was driven from men ; his dwelling was with the beasts of the field. Years passed away, and at length Nebuchadnezzar rose up from his degradation, a wiser and a better man. He lifted his eyes to heaven, his understanding was restored, and he blessed the Most High.

These reflections will, we trust, be sufficient to persuade us that the judgments of God are not vindictive ; but that the object contemplated even in the infliction of heavy punishment upon men, is their own true happiness. It is true the history of mankind unfolds sad scenes, but these may be traced to *sin* ; this ‘ brought death into the world and all our wo.’

It is for no idle purpose that the wrath of the Almighty goeth forth

as a tempest—that nations are overthrown—the proudest and oldest institutions prostrated—one king pulled down and another raised up. The unseen Spirit of the Most High is there, bringing order out of confusion, educing good from evil. War, pestilence, famine, these are but instruments directed by an invisible but mighty arm. Let us look around us. Are there no judgments now to be observed upon the earth? Have they exerted their proper influence upon us?

There is a disease which taking its rise in an idolatrous country has invaded nation after nation, until it hath been named ‘the scourge of nations:’ it hath spared neither age nor sex—it hath not respected rank or power—but clad in gloom, and followed by lamentation and weeping, it hath gone on pushing its conquest of death wider and wider. Have we not shared in public calamities? Have we suffered no private bereavements? Hath the hand of the Lord been upon us, and have we not yet returned unto Him? Let us be warned by the fate of others not to persist in rebellion until the fearful admonition comes to us from insulted Heaven, ‘Prepare to meet thy God.’

The second thought suggested by this subject is, that when the object contemplated by the judgments of God is not accomplished, those who have been subjected to them must prepare to meet God as an enemy.

The message to the Israelites, upon which we are now remarking, is manifestly in the style of a challenge, and a sublime and unequalled description of the power of their great adversary is given in the succeeding verse. They are told to expect Him to come in His strength and take vengeance upon them, and they are called on to consider whether they are able to contend with Him.

Under this view let us consider the subject. That every man must meet God is certain. Reason and revelation both teach this. It will be sufficient here to remark, that it is declared by St. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians, that ‘We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.’

That the hopeless nature of the controversy between God and His impenitent people may be fully perceived and felt, let us pursue the view of this subject presented by the prophet. No where have we met with any thing more sublime: ‘Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. For lo, He that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, the Lord, the God of hosts is His name.’

For lo, He that formeth the mountains. How forcibly does this represent the strength of God; He that formeth the *mountains*. Compare these with the works of man. How long does it occupy his skill, and industry, and strength to construct poor improvements and accomplish little objects—and these presently decay. But God throws a vast chain of mountains over a whole continent, and there they stand everlasting monuments of strength, witnessing the passing away of generations, and the destruction of empires. Man with difficulty ascends their steep sides, and standing upon their brow looks out upon plains and cities and rivers beneath his feet. He that formeth the mountains!

And createth the wind. Not only is His power displayed in forming works of grandeur which frown upon the littleness of man and defy his strength—but He controls those things which are subtile and unseen ; which elude his grasp and baffle his skill. The wind—what an instrument in the hands of God ! See the tempest as it sweeps over the earth in its unmeasured strength—prostrating forests—destroying cities—hurling into ruin the proudest works of man : or, as it turns its terrible power upon the great deep, scattering mighty fleets, sporting with

‘Armaments, which thunder-strike the walls
Of rock-built cities,’

rolling the billows mountain high against the resounding shore, and dashing the frail ship in pieces as a potter’s vessel.

And declareth unto man what is his thought. He reads the veiled secrets of the heart ; he penetrates the thoughts and purposes of artful man. Against the Almighty no policy can prevail ; all skill is baffled. What an adversary is this ! In the conflicts of human life prudence and enterprise are worth much, but in contending with God their power is lost.

That maketh the morning darkness. See the shades of night retiring,

‘For yonder comes the glorious king of day,
Rejoicing in the east.’

The earth rejoices under his brightness ; the birds are abroad with their songs, and men go forth to the business of life. Over half a world the glorious light is spread out, and the cheerful voice of life is heard. But lo, the Almighty arm is stretched forth—the sun is driven back in his course—his splendor is veiled—darkness falls upon the earth like a pall—nature is hushed, and men grope their way in thick night. What a sublime strength is here displayed by the adversary of frail man. This may be understood too to mean that upon the glory of life’s young morning, He can bring the darkness of disappointment and despair.

And treadeth upon the high places of the earth. It is believed that what is mainly intended by this is, that God is above all earthly distinctions ; that the great and the mighty, and the poor and the humble, the king and the beggar, the palace and the hovel are alike to Him ; that He treadeth upon the proud, and vanquisheth the strong, and overthroweth fortified places.

The Lord. The ruler—He whom all things obey, whose empire is boundless.

The God of hosts is His name. How striking is this ; hosts are at his command. Look abroad ; strive to calculate the number of worlds which almighty power has created. Call in the aid of science and you are overwhelmed with the immensity of the contemplation. Added to the number with which science is acquainted, there must be a multitude undiscovered. In the language of Dr. Chalmers, ‘What is seen may be nothing to what is unseen : for what is seen is limited by the range of our instruments. Though this earth and these heavens were to disappear, there are other worlds which roll afar ; the light of other suns shines upon them ; and the sky which mantles them is garnished with other stars.’ He illustrates his thought finely : ‘The universe at large would suffer as little in its splendor and variety, by the destruction

of our planet, as the verdure and sublime magnitude of a forest would suffer by the fall of a single leaf.'

Over all the mighty population of these countless worlds the power of God extends. How utterly hopeless then, must be a controversy with Him whose resources are so ample, who can call up from every world hosts to swell the ranks of His mighty army.

Who can meet God as an enemy? If we remain impenitent, as an enemy He must be met: the frail strength which we possess must conflict with the power of the Almighty.

What then is the part of wisdom? A king goes forth with an army of ten thousand; he spreads out his force in battle array; he awaits the hour of conflict which is to decide his destiny. Presently the sound of approaching hosts is borne upon the air and breaks upon his attentive ear, and upon a distant height he sees many banners waving, and the gleam of a hundred thousand spears. The report comes to him that his force is vastly outnumbered, and that all is lost. Does he await the coming of his foe, and expose his people to certain ruin? If he is wise, in the language of our Lord, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an embassy and desireth conditions of peace.

Let us imitate this wisdom. Let us meet God as penitents who need mercy. Then all the power He wields is exerted in our behalf, and as we look forth upon the heavens and the earth, and contemplate the countless worlds which move in their ample sweep about the throne of God, and survey the mighty benevolence which breathes through all and blesses all, we shall exclaim, 'The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice; let the multitudes of isles be glad thereof.'

From the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. JAMES TOWNLEY, D. D.

BY THE REV. ELIJAH HOOLE.

THE name of the late Rev. James Townley, D. D., is justly dear to an extensive circle of surviving relatives and friends; it is held in affectionate remembrance by many thousands in the Wesleyan Methodist societies of which he was, from early life, a member and a minister; and it is known and respected by many beyond that community, in consequence of the interesting works which he published, and the services which he rendered, by his industrious researches, to the cause of learning in general, and to the lover of Biblical literature in particular.

Of such a character it would be desirable to have a lengthened memoir. Many are the valuable lessons it would suggest. A history of increasing experience in personal religion, and of a holy walk with God; of a ministerial career, whose precious results were the conversion of many souls from sin to holiness, and increase and edification to the Church; and of that diligent study which, notwithstanding the unavoidable and frequent interruptions of numerous official avocations, was rewarded with an extensive knowledge of ancient ecclesiastical history, and a familiar acquaintance with Biblical criticism; could not fail to be instructive to all the followers of Christ, encouraging to the

junior laborers in the same vineyard, and deeply interesting to such as, under similar circumstances, are not unmindful of the pleasures and toils of literary pursuits.

It is therefore regretted that materials for such a memoir do not exist. Dr. Townley left no connected record of the circumstances of his life; and it is to the recollections cherished by his friends, and a reference to his works, that we are chiefly indebted for the following particulars.

James Townley was born of respectable parents in Manchester, May 11th, 1774. His father, Mr. Thomas Townley, was in extensive business. His mother, a very sensible woman, was a regular attendant at the services of the established Church, and an occasional hearer at the evening services in the Methodist chapel. Her maternal faithfulness and affection were eminently conspicuous in the sedulous attention she paid to the best interests of James, her youngest child. The influence of this excellent parent's example and counsel was happily successful. Filial love and religious feelings were observable traits in the character of her beloved son even in infancy; and when, as a youth, his thoughtless associates had carried him to the fascinating amusements of the theatre, her advice sufficed to induce him, at once and for ever, to renounce a gratification, which with a boyish folly he had persuaded himself was both innocent and beneficial.

The care of his education was entrusted for some years to the late Rev. David Simpson, of Macclesfield: after his death he was continued at the school of his curate, where he was instructed in some departments of classical literature, and passed through the usual routine of an English education.

Mr. Townley's early religious impressions were powerfully re-awakened by the solemn services connected with the funeral of the Rev. David Simpson, and particularly by the address then delivered; an event which he frequently alluded to in after life, and generally with deep emotion. He returned from the school in Macclesfield to Manchester, and became a member of the Methodist society. His course in the Christian life was evidently progressive: 'the spirit of bondage unto fear,' painfully disclosing to him the corruption of his nature, and the sinfulness of his life, was succeeded by the 'Spirit of adoption,' which bore testimony to his believing heart of his interest in the redemption by the Lord Jesus Christ, effecting in him also that new and spiritual character which fitted him for the service of his Divine Master in whatever sphere of life he might be called to move.

The consistency of his religious profession and the gravity of his deportment, at this early period, may be concluded from the circumstance, that in his seventeenth year he introduced family prayer into his father's house with the entire approval of his parents; and when about nineteen years of age he began to labor as a local preacher in Manchester and its immediate neighborhood, under the direction of the venerable Alexander Mather.

He did not enter upon this important work without much anxiety and serious reflection. He was greatly apprehensive of self-deception, and feared to run before he was sent; but his path brightened before him; the ministry of the 'word of reconciliation' became his

delight ; with much prayer, and entire dedication to God, he gave himself to the work of the Lord.

With a view to the direction of his future life, he had been placed in the house of an eminent cotton merchant in Manchester. His employer was a good and benevolent man, of another denomination of Christians, who knew how to estimate his integrity and piety ; and under such auspices, the prospects of Mr. Townley, in that metropolis of commerce and wealth, may be considered encouraging. But Providence had marked out for him another course. His employer, when informed by him that he was about to quit his service to become an itinerant preacher in the Methodist connection, replied that he would not readily have consented to part with him for any other cause ; and either then, or at an immediately subsequent interview, he generously presented him with one hundred pounds, for the purchase of books, as a token of his regard.

In his twenty-second year, Mr. Townley was received on probation as a travelling preacher by the Wesleyan Methodist conference. From this time till the year 1832, when by a failure of health he was compelled to retire, a period of six-and-thirty years, he continued, with uniform consistency and increasing honor, to fulfil his duties as a minister, and to occupy some of the most important offices of the connection to which he belonged.

Without particularly mentioning the different circuits to which he was successively appointed, it is sufficient to say, that many persons in each of them have in remembrance his intelligent and faithful ministry, tempered as it was with tenderness and discretion. In several instances his wise counsel and conciliatory deportment rendered him successful, under the Divine blessing, in allaying some degree of uneasiness which had been excited in the societies under his pastoral care. The advantages resulting from his wise and gracious ministry in Stockport are well remembered. In Warrington, during his stay, the chapel was enlarged, and the society greatly increased ; the debt which had burdened the society was also considerably reduced. In Bradford he saw a revival of the work of God, and under the date of January 19th, 1826, he writes, ‘ Mr. T. H. Walker and I met some of the persons who have received good during the revival : seventy-six were present, who professed to enjoy the blessing of entire sanctification ; and more than forty to have received a sense of justification. It was a most blessed time. ‘Glory be to God alone.’ Many indeed were the seals of his ministry ; even after he was laid aside by affliction his heart was sometimes made to glow with gratitude, and his eyes to fill with tears, by the intelligence of one and another who had been brought to God under his ministry, and by his visitation of the sick in past years, when he had not been immediately acquainted with the fruit of his labors.

The life of a Methodist preacher, attentive to the great business of his calling, is at all times one of much exertion ; his Sunday ministrations, and his daily engagements in the pulpit and at the bedside of the afflicted, throughout an extensive circuit, make large demands on his mental and physical energies. Mr. Townley found this to be the case in his own experience ; yet, by economy of time, and by persevering diligence, he successfully cultivated sacred literature ; and pre-

sented to the world several publications of considerable merit and value ; beside those occasional compositions, which do not bear his name, some of them having only a temporary or local interest.

In addition to the advantages of education, Mr. Townley had received the impulse arising from early literary associations. While in Manchester he had become a member of a Philological Society, originated by the late Dr. Adam Clarke ; and, in common with many other young men, was urged, by the example and exhortations of that celebrated scholar, to great diligence in the pursuit of knowledge, the fruits of which were seen throughout his future course. His first publication of note was a volume of 'Biblical Anecdotes,' which appeared in the year 1814. He had been desired by his children to preach them a sermon on the history of the Holy Scriptures, and on the early translations of them into different languages. As he found that they and others were delighted with the facts he had collected and arranged for their information, he yielded to the farther request of his family, and prepared the volume already mentioned. In the Methodist Magazine for that year, it is said, that 'the work abounds with important and interesting matter, well digested and well expressed, and contains proper references to the authorities by which the historic facts recorded in it are supported.'

The work which next proceeded from his pen was one which procured to him considerable celebrity in the literary and religious world. Appearing about seven years after the publication of his 'Biblical Anecdotes,' it affords striking evidence that he continued his diligent researches into ecclesiastical history and sacred criticism, with unabated ardour. It was entitled 'Illustrations of Biblical Literature, exhibiting the History and Fate of the Sacred Writings, from the earliest period to the present century, including notices of translators and other eminent Biblical scholars.'

It was no small tribute to its worth, that a review of it, for the Methodist Magazine, was written by one of the most accomplished Biblical scholars of the present day. He thus describes it :—'These volumes present a connected view of the history of Biblical translations from the earliest date to the present century, and are enriched by most copious and interesting biographical notices of the most eminent scholars and critics, and such occasional sketches of the history of the manners and superstitions of the darker ages, as may illustrate the advantages to be derived from a more general dissemination of the inspired writings.'

The magnitude and extent of the research required in the compilation of this elaborate work can only be fully appreciated by those who have been engaged in similar pursuits. Many volumes had to be read, in some cases, for the composition of a single page, and those volumes in old monkish Latin or in obsolete French. To ascertain a date, it was often necessary to search and compare many writings of his predecessors ; and frequently had he to suspend his proceedings for several weeks, while waiting for books to be sent from Germany or other parts of the continent, to establish facts not otherwise to be correctly ascertained. His residence for several years in the neighborhood of Manchester greatly favored his design, by affording him free and constant access to the collegiate library in that town ; an

establishment so rich in ancient Biblical literature, that, when the late Archbishop of Dublin was compiling his work on the Atonement, he resided several weeks in Manchester for the sole purpose of having uninterrupted reference to the books there deposited.

The literary excellence of Mr. Townley's erudite and valuable work was acknowledged in almost every respectable periodical of the day ; and procured for him from an American university the well earned honor of the degree of Doctor in Divinity ; an honor equally creditable to those who conferred it, and to him who received it. He was considered by most literary men as happy in the choice of a subject on which to employ his industry and embody its results. He delighted in his task ; and subsequent to the publication of his work in three volumes, pursued the same subject with so much diligence, as to amass a quantity of most interesting information equal to one of the preceding volumes, which it was his design to incorporate with his work in a second impression, and which, by the adoption of a smaller type, he purposed to compress into two volumes. Many were the communications he received complimentary to his talents. On his visit to Ireland, as president of the conference, in the year 1830, he was congratulated by several members of the Dublin University, and the highest encomiums were pronounced on his performance. The whole of the first edition having been sold, all the preachers of the Methodist conference in Ireland gave their names as subscribers to a second edition, the publication of which would have proved generally acceptable, and was called for by many ; but his circumstances did not warrant him, however desirous, to venture on a speculation so extensive ; the additional matter, therefore, still remains in manuscript.

Doctor Townley was not insensible to the commendations bestowed upon his work ; nor was he unmindful of the credit reflected by it on the body of Christians with which he was connected. Had he written solely for fame, he might have been content to desist from farther authorship ; but he still continued his literary pursuits in the same useful direction. In 1824 he published a volume of 'Essays on various subjects of Ecclesiastical History and Antiquity.' Several of these elegant compositions had previously appeared in the Methodist Magazine and other periodicals ; yet the volume was well received. It contains much curious information concerning the early corruptions of the patriarchal religion, and on the subject of Christian antiquities, not to be found collected together in any other book in the English language.

The next contribution of Dr. Townley to the literature of his country was a translation into English of the '*More Nevochim* of Maimonides ; or, Reasons for the law of Moses,' with prefatory dissertations and appended notes, displaying considerable acquaintance with Jewish learning, and the results of much patient research. Rabbi Ben Maimon was a Jewish physician of great literary note in the thirteenth century. It appears to have been his object to show that many of the ceremonial precepts of the Mosaic institution were rational and just, independently of the spiritual meaning which may be conveyed by them. His book does not assume a controversial form ; and perhaps was not intended as an attack on Christianity, but rather to embody

certain illustrations of the Levitical code, for the information of such Jews as might be curious in matters of their law. It was a boon to the world to present in an English dress a book so constantly referred to by Biblical critics, and without which no library of Scripture criticism can be considered complete. For the composition of the doctor's own portion of this volume, the best authors were consulted; the essays and notes are drawn up with great judgment and clearness, and drew forth the most gratifying commendations from high and respectable quarters. But works merely critical rarely acquire sudden popularity; they are but slowly introduced to the library of the studious; it takes time and frequent reference to discover their value. The doctor had experience of this in the sale of this volume, which is yet only partially known; and it is not improbable, that the disappointment arising from this circumstance prevented the desired appearance of the second edition of his '*Illustrations of Biblical Literature.*'

Doctor Townley's last publication was an '*Introduction to the critical study of the Old and New Testaments,*' embodying much of that correct and interesting information which his peculiar taste and reading had rendered familiar to him. This volume has been very widely circulated, and is much admired. It is fully worthy of the piety and talents of its author. The book of God was his favorite study, and the productions of his pen chiefly tended to aid those who love to follow him in tracing its interesting history, and are desirous to understand its sacred contents.

In 1826 Dr. Townley removed from Bradford to London, and was associated with three others in the pastoral care of the Queen-street circuit; and at the conference of 1827 he was appointed to the onerous and responsible office of general secretary to the Wesleyan Missionary Society. In this capacity he maintained the reputation of his previous life. His colleagues found him amiable and affectionate; he was ready for every public service; and he willingly bore a due share of the heavy responsibility connected with the management of the important interests of the society at home and abroad; while the missionaries found in him a faithful and wise counsellor and an unvarying friend.

Connected with the missions, he entertained a wakeful solicitude for their welfare, and indulged a grateful exultation at their success.— Yet he almost necessarily took that view of the spread of Christianity which his reading and previous pursuits were calculated to suggest.— He projected a *History of Christian Missions*, to embrace all the important facts on record, in every language, relating to any mission of whatever Church, for the conversion of mankind to the knowledge and faith of Christ:—a work which, if successfully executed, would have possessed uncommon interest and value. It would have brought out of obscurity the names of many who, in ancient times, were highly honored of God in the instruction and moral subjugation of many savage and pagan tribes of Europe, as well as of Africa and Asia; it would have edified the Church by memorials of the most active piety and patient zeal; it would have afforded the best means for comparing the modes of operation and the success of ancient and modern missions; and would have placed in striking contrast the missions of nominal Churches, merely political in their bearing and character, with

those which have their origin in Christian zeal, and whose object is the glory of God in the salvation of the souls of men.

When Dr. Townley's habits of research and practised ability in the examination of ancient records are considered, and the facts already stored in his memory by extensive reading, and the friendly terms of correspondence with which he was favored by one of the librarians of the Vatican, and by other literati at home and abroad, as well as the constant communication he held with missionaries in every part of the world, it cannot but be regretted very deeply, that, while holding the office of secretary to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, he had not leisure to carry his projected work into effect; and that, after he had retired from the labors of public life, his state of health never permitted him to resume those habits of arduous literary toil which he had formerly cultivated, and which were necessary to the accomplishment of so laborious and comprehensive an undertaking. Under the effects of a distressing and debilitating indisposition, and with the disadvantage of an entire exclusion from his own library, being then in temporary lodgings in Ramsgate for the recovery of his health, he drew up a very interesting sketch of the history of some of the most remarkable missions of the Christian Church, ancient and modern, which was first read in part at a meeting of the Local Branch Missionary Society, and afterward adorned the pages of some successive numbers of the Methodist Magazine for the year 1834; affording, however, but a faint idea of what the projected work would have been, had circumstances favored its execution.

At the conference held in Sheffield, July and August, 1829, Dr. Townley was elected to the chair; and thus received the highest honor Methodism confers, and the most decided proof of the confidence and love of his brethren in the ministry.

His even piety, his amiable mildness, and his usual ability, were as conspicuous while he held the office of president of the conference as they had been in a more private station. He was equally beloved and respected; his official visits to various parts of the connection were seasons of great religious enjoyment to those with whom he was called to associate, a remembrance of which is gratefully cherished in many hearts. The year of his presidency was one of great peace, and of some enlargement to the Methodist society. The writer of this memoir had the privilege of being associated with Dr. Townley at the Mission House, for the whole of that year, and can personally testify the sacred anxiety with which he regarded every interest of the connection at home and abroad, and his daily attention to the various duties of his office.

Before the close of this year of honorable labor, Dr. Townley's health began seriously to decline. By the preceding British conference he had been appointed to preside at the Irish conference of 1830. With this object he proceeded to Dublin in the month of June; and during his stay his attention to business was almost incessant; while his sterling character, his pleasing manners, and his interesting conversational powers, had the effect of endearing his society not only to the preachers assembled in conference, but also to the literary, intelligent, and pious, of every rank and denomination to whom he was introduced. It would appear, however, that his exertions were greater than

his constitution was fitted to sustain. On his return to England he proceeded to Leeds, to preside, in the course of his official duty, at the committees preparatory to the conference then about to assemble ; but it became apparent that he was struggling against pain and exhaustion ; and when he was relieved by the election of his successor, it was found necessary to take medical advice, and for the present to avoid farther exertion.

From this period his constitution never fully recovered its tone : for two additional years, however, he retained the laborious office of secretary to the missions ; but retired as a supernumerary at the conference of 1832, when it was apparent that his days could only be prolonged by a total cessation from the cares and business of public life.

For this event his mind had been prepared by the painful and alarming character of his indisposition, which had been increasing for several months, and by the consequent inability to take the whole of his duties as secretary ; yet it cannot be imagined that he was removed from a work of so much interest and responsibility, to a station of comparatively useless retirement, without deep emotions of heart.— But he laid himself in the dust before God, and acknowledged that, after he had done all, he was an unprofitable servant.

In the autumn of 1832 he removed from London to Ramsgate ; and when settled there, resuming his privilege as a private member of society, he united himself to a class, and received his quarterly tickets with thankfulness. In the holy communion of this little Christian assembly, of which for a short time before his decease he became the leader, he was accustomed to express himself in terms so humble and self-abasing as to excite the admiration and love of those who listened to him ; and afforded a practical instance of the combination of exalted attainments in spiritual knowledge with true lowliness of heart.

Soon after his removal to Ramsgate the more distressing symptoms of his complaint in some measure subsided ; his spirits resumed a cheerful tone, and a partial recovery of his strength encouraged the indulgence of hope that he might yet be spared many years to his family and to the Church. He preached once in Ramsgate without experiencing any extraordinary weariness or other inconvenience ; he afterward visited Margate, and preached at the anniversary of the Missionary Society. The exertion, however, proved to be too great for his strength ; he relapsed into a state of severe pain and great debility, from which he never afterward recovered.

Meantime his spirit was evidently ripening for the holy society of heaven ; he possessed his soul in patience, and his mind was graciously supported. Toward the close of his last illness his symptoms became very distressing, and his sufferings were extreme ; but his confidence in God was unshaken ; he reposed on the satisfaction of Christ, and, rejoicing in the hope of everlasting life through Him, he could even 'glory in tribulation also.' His sufferings terminated December 12th, 1833, when he died in great peace, and in the full triumph of faith. He was in the sixtieth year of his age.

Dr. Townley was twice married. His first union with Miss Mary Marsden, of London, had a happy continuance of nearly thirty years, and was eminently conducive to his domestic happiness, and to his

usefulness in the Church of God. He had a mind very susceptible of social enjoyment ; and therefore deeply felt the loss of his deservedly much beloved wife. At the time of her decease they had seven surviving children ; their eldest son, a youth of much piety and of promising talent, having died before her, to the great grief of his parents, at the age of twenty-two.

He entered a second time into the marriage state with Miss Dinah Ball, of London ; a lady well able to appreciate his character. It was her mournful gratification to minister to his comfort in his declining health, and to smooth his passage to the grave. She and his children are now left for a season to sorrow over a painful bereavement, and a temporary separation from one who must always live in their dearest affections. But they 'sorrow not as those without hope ;' they rejoice in the glorious state of their departed relative : in his life and death they have an example bright and attractive, urging on them an additional incentive and encouragement to be 'followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.'

Dr. Townley possessed naturally an excellent disposition, which, sanctified and exalted by the power of Divine grace, rendered him truly amiable. In all the domestic and social relations of life he was an object of affection to a degree not ordinarily attained ; while the judgment which tempered the disinterested tenderness of his character procured for him reverence, as well as love, from those who composed the circle of his own family. His daughter Ann says, 'The beauty of my dear father's home character could never be fully appreciated by those who had not come under its influence. In all the common occurrences of life he displayed a refinement of feeling, and a delicacy of consideration for the feelings of others, that is rarely met with. His friends knew him to be kind, generous, and sympathizing ; but they little knew how tenderly affectionate, how free from every selfish thought, his family found him. During his last indisposition there was a rapidly maturing spirit strikingly evidenced in his manner of conducting family worship. His prayers, at all times characterized by child-like simplicity, became, during his long and painful illness, so full of faith and fervor, so evidently recognizing the gracious intentions of his heavenly Father in taking the seat of the refiner, that many times have we risen from our knees with the overwhelming conviction that the furnace had not been heated in vain, that the silver was purged from the dross, and the process would prove a final one. In the midst of the most intense agony there was a calm and holy reposing on the bosom of his Savior that told to all that patience had had her perfect work. If pain and spasm wrung from him an involuntary indication of suffering, it was invariably followed by an acknowledgment of the hand that moved the rod. The emphasis with which at such moments he would say, "My Father!" "My Sanctifier!" I shall never forget.— At other times he would exclaim, "O take me home, take me home!" and then, with watchful jealousy lest he should encroach upon the supremacy of his Redeemer's will, he would add, "But not my will, not my will, but thine, be done ; when thy work is accomplished ; at thine own appointed time ;" with other expressions of the like nature.'

In his intercourse with general society he affected not the high bearing which sometimes clings to men of age and reputation : the young

as well as the mature sought the pleasure of his cheerful and instructive conversation; the afflicted were often soothed by his attentions and sympathy; and to all his countenance was the index of a kind and peaceful heart, the seat of the truest philanthropy, because under the influence of Divine love.

His character as a Christian was remarkably uniform and consistent. He had high views of what the follower of Christ should be; his aim was to imitate and follow his heavenly Master. In the regulation of his own daily conversation and conduct he was eminently successful. His kindness of heart did not render him insensible to sin in others; but in reproofing a fault, he united delicacy with faithfulness in such a manner as seldom to fail in producing the desired effect, and in making an indelible impression.

His literary acquirements gave him great advantage as a minister of the word of God; often furnishing him with happy illustrations of Divine truth new to his hearers, and serving, with a faithful application, to fasten it permanently in their memories and hearts. The language of his public ministrations, though strictly extemporaneous, was always chaste and good; and if his sermons did not bear the traces of ingenuity which distinguish the pulpit eloquence of some eminent men, it is sufficient to remark that they had the excellence of a clear exposition of Scripture doctrine, and a judicious selection from those stores of knowledge which proved him to be a scribe well instructed in the Gospel of the kingdom, bringing from his treasures things new and old. The only sermon he ever prepared for the press is to be found in a volume of sermons by various Wesleyan ministers, published at the conference office in 1833: it treats on his favorite subject, is written in an elegant style, and is fully worthy of the place it occupies among the admirable sermons of which the volume is composed.

But in no circumstances did his character shine with greater lustre than in affliction. For the last few years of his life he was a subject of many severe trials, personal and domestic. Every member of his family recollects the tenderness of his sympathy, and the unwearied kindness of his attentions, when sickness was allowed to visit them. Many times in the day, on some occasions, with his dearest earthly friend, would he approach the throne of grace; on the reception of painful tidings he would seek his aid in God, and having committed the matter to his heavenly Father, he would unhesitatingly say, 'Thy will be done.' His resignation, and his unwavering confidence in God, had much influence even on his literary character: some of his most valued writings were composed while affectionately watching, through the silent night, the sick bed of his late afflicted wife. The same cheerful confidence predominated during his own afflictions: for many years he suffered from a periodical head-ache, which usually made it necessary for him to stand nearly four-and-twenty hours in a leaning position against the wall, and occurred about every fortnight; but, under this suffering, and during his last painful and protracted illness, he never murmured, but was entirely resigned to the Divine will. The heat of the furnace did not consume, but only refine and brighten, his excellencies. In him was seen a practical illustration of the reasonableness of 'glorying in tribulation also.' And in contemplating such instances of the sufficiency of Divine grace in the extreme trials of human

nature, we learn the moral effect of that doctrine of Christianity he so cordially embraced, 'That the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.' To conclude: ascribing all the honor to the abounding mercy and grace of God, we exhibit the Christian character of the subject of this memoir as an example worthy to be emulated, and coincide with the sentiment expressed by the writer of a review of one of the doctor's valuable works, that 'such men as Dr. Townley are ornaments to human nature.'

PROFESSOR STUART'S ESSAY.

THE following Essay was written last September, in reference to a premium offered by the executive committee of the Revival Tract Society, for 'a tract on the question, What is the duty of the Churches in regard to the use of fermented (alcoholic) wine in celebrating the Lord's Supper?' The writer received, soon after the question was proposed to the public, a special request from some one connected with the proposal, as he has a right to presume, (although the letter was anonymous,) that he would write upon this question. Accordingly he wrote, and his piece was handed in to the depository named in the proposals, early last October. Before it was sent, it was read to some friends in Albany, deeply engaged in promoting temperance measures, in order to see whether the sentiments were such as they embraced and were willing to defend. Those friends were pleased to signify their approbation of the sentiments contained in the piece. Immediately after this it was sent to the depository, and after lying there for nearly seven months, and nothing being said to the public respecting any determination of the committee who were to judge of the merits of the pieces sent in, it was, at the request of the friends in Albany and in accordance with the express desire of the writer, withdrawn from the depository, in order to be published.

This statement is not designed in any measure to inculcate the committee of adjudication, the depository, or the executive committee of the Tract Society; for the writer is wholly ignorant of the circumstances which led to such an unusual delay, excepting that he has heard that the pieces sent in were mislaid, and for a time not to be found. Not feeling any anxiety to secure the premium, even if this might have been done, (of which of course he cannot feel any assurance,) and sincerely wishing to aid his friends in Albany in the great and good cause in which they are engaged, he has withdrawn the piece from the depository for the sake of publication in the Albany periodicals, at the present time.

The writer is almost afraid to make the statement as above, lest it should be thought to be his intention to cast some blame on those concerned with the proposal or adjudication of the question, which was originally the occasion of his writing. He entirely disclaims any such motive. He fully believes that no one concerned in the business had the remotest intentions of any improper dealing with the pieces sent in. He makes the present statement only to account for the form, manner, and occasion of the piece.

MOSES STUART.

Andover, Theol. Sem., May 4, 1835.

What is the duty of the Churches, in regard to the use of fermented (alcoholic) wine, in celebrating the Lord's Supper?

A satisfactory answer to this question is necessarily connected with the present state of the temperance question in general. What positions in respect to this may be regarded as well established, and what still remain in a greater or less degree doubtful, are inquiries that of course precede the discussion of the subject immediately before us.

A brief answer to these inquiries is all that can be expected on this occasion; and in reality such an answer is all that is desirable. So widely diffused at present are the excellent publications in different parts of our country, on the subject of temperance, that there is no reader in any of the walks of life, who may not have access to a knowledge of its leading principles, and few indeed to whom they are not in some degree known.

The points that are universally admitted by reasonable and considerate men, of whatever denomination or party, may be summarily stated as follows:—

1. All *intoxication* is forbidden by the Scriptures, and by the laws of our physical nature. Those who do not admit the authority of the Bible will concede that intoxication is injurious to health, usefulness, estate, morals, and reputation. It follows,

2. That all such use of intoxicating liquors of any kind, as will produce drunkenness, or injure health or usefulness, is unlawful.

Argument on these subjects is no longer necessary for the mass of our community, and surely it is not needed for Christians. Among these, moreover, and among all sober and judicious men in our community, with few exceptions, the following positions may be regarded as fully and finally established; viz.,

That the habitual and common use of ardent spirits, or distilled intoxicating liquors in any form, or the manufacturing and vending of them for common use as a drink, is an IMMORALITY.

The United States Temperance Convention, held at Philadelphia, and composed of more than four hundred delegates of highly respectable character and great influence, the state temperance convention held at Worcester in Massachusetts, composed of more than five hundred delegates from all parts of that commonwealth, a similar convention held at Utica in the state of New-York, another at Middletown in Connecticut, also at Columbus in Ohio, and at Jackson in Mississippi—state conventions, moreover, in Vermont, Maine, and New-Jersey; a convention of cities in New-York; several legislative and judicial temperance societies, and particular societies in counties, towns, districts, and parishes, with several thousands of Christian Churches, have all united in the expression of the opinion, that the habitual use of ardent spirits, or the manufacturing and vending of them as a common drink, *is an immorality*. There are still, I acknowledge, some professed Christians who have doubts respecting this; and of course they are not satisfied that the practices in question are an offence against the laws of Christ, which ought to subject a member of a Church to its discipline. The number of these however, is evidently diminishing; and we may believe and trust that the time is not far distant, when there will be an opinion among all professed Christians in our country,

which will accord with the present prevailing sentiment at least as extensively as temperance itself prevails.

Among no class of citizens is the opinion that drinking ardent spirits is injurious more widely diffused or more firmly held, than among *physicians*. To their distinguished honor be it said, that contrary to their pecuniary and worldly interests, they have come forward, and already more than *two thousand* of them have testified that in no case does drinking of ardent spirits promote health ; that it increases exposure to disease, and renders the management of this, when existing, much more difficult, and the issue more dangerous.

This testimony being allowed, (and who is competent to contradict it?) it follows, that *the use of ardent spirit as a common drink is a sin against our physical nature*. The unbeliever therefore, who professes to be only the disciple of natural religion, as well as he who admits the authority of revelation, must confess that the general and particular temperance conventions of our land, assembled for the sake of discussing questions pertaining to the subject of temperance, have rightly decided that the using or vending of ardent spirit as a common drink IS AN IMMORALITY.

Such then are the general positions at present, in regard to the subject of temperance, positions which may now be taken as a basis for future argument and action. Accordingly I shall so consider them, in the remainder of this Essay ; and consequently I may leave them without farther remark.

But there is one interesting part of this great subject which yet remains in some degree unsettled in the minds of many sober and excellent men. A great part of the temperance conventions and societies have as yet, in their discussions and decisions, left the question respecting *the use of wines* untouched. It is well that they have done so ; for it is always best in such great matters as this respecting temperance, first to produce, if possible, union of sentiment and action on points that are of a plainer and more fundamental nature. This being done, and the general subject being better understood by a course of discussion and experiments, points that seemed to be difficult or doubtful at first may finally have such light cast upon them as that a general union of sentiment may be produced respecting them.

Some of the general conventions, however, on the subject of temperance, and many local societies and Churches, have already considered the question as it respects *wines* and every species of intoxicating liquors, and have decided the broad and general principle, that *duty requires abstinence FROM ALL INTOXICATING LIQUORS of every kind and name*. The simple basis of their reasoning may be stated in a few words.

'The Scriptures forbid all *intoxication*, in any degree. The laws of our physical and mental nature equally forbid it ; because both body and mind are injured by it. No species of liquor which intoxicates can be used habitually, without great danger of forming an excessive attachment to it ; for so the universal voice of experience decides.— No person, therefore, can indulge himself in the habitual or frequent use of any liquor which has an inebriating quality, without at the same time incurring the danger of forming a habit which will prove injurious to him, and which may be fatal. Now it cannot be innocent nor consistent for those who are taught to pray, *Lead me not into temptation,*

thus voluntarily to rush into it. It is a settled point—one now past all dispute—that WATER IS THE BEST AND SAFEST OF ALL DRINKS. No other liquor therefore can be *necessary*; some medicinal cases only excepted, which need not be and are not here brought into the account. It follows then, since water is the best of all drinks, and since no intoxicating liquor can be taken either habitually or frequently without danger, that it is contrary to the true spirit of Christianity and to the laws of our physical and intellectual nature, to indulge in the frequent or habitual use of wine, or of any other liquor which can inebriate.'

Thus do the Churches and societies argue, who have proscribed the common use of wine. Most of them advance indeed still farther.—They are willing to make the supposition that wine does no harm as a common drink, in order to present the most favorable side of the argument to those who differ from them in opinion. Allowing now for the sake of argument that it does no harm, they have still another and an important question to ask, viz., *Does it do any good?* Physically or mentally, (a few cases of bodily indisposition excepted, where stimulant is temporarily required,) habitual or often repeated stimulus does no good, except merely to gratify the taste. All well educated and sober physicians are now agreed that habitual or frequent stimulus of any kind must not only do no good, but inevitably do harm in the end. The reason is very plain. He who takes stimulus in health can derive little or no benefit from it in sickness. The gratification of taste then seems to be the only good that is to be accomplished by the common or frequent use of wines. But is this of so high and noble a nature that it should be sought after and indulged in by a Christian at the expense and hazard which must of necessity attend it? And beside, it is quite certain that the drinkers of pure water acquire a higher relish for that element, and have more enjoyment in partaking of it than ever falls to the lot of those who habitually indulge in the drinking of wine. Those who have made a fair experiment of both may be confidently appealed to for a decision on this question.

To the inquiry then, Does the drinking of wine often or habitually do any good? the persons in question suppose we may answer without any hesitation, that it accomplishes *no important* good; that it sacrifices a greater good, even on the score of taste only; and that the danger with which it is *always* attended makes it at the very best a practice of great hazard.

The writer of this, who for a long time after the efforts to bring about the temperance reformation had commenced, did not think it expedient to bring forward the discussion respecting *wines*, is persuaded that the time has now come, in which the question should be fully and fairly discussed. After often and deliberately examining the subject proffered by the question, what is the fundamental inquiry for every true friend of temperance to make, in order to satisfy himself as to the course which duty now bids him to take; he cannot perceive that this inquiry can amount to more or less than what is contained in the question: *Is INTOXICATION ITSELF, or only the METHOD in which intoxication is produced, the main subject of our concern?*

How can the sober inquirer after simple truth and duty hesitate as to the answer which should be given to this last question? Is it of any serious importance to a man, either as it respects his body or mind,

or of any serious importance to society, whether he intoxicates himself with rum, or brandy, or gin, or wine, or any other spirituous liquor? I admit that some of these liquors are more costly than others, and some of them more immediately and highly deleterious than others. Drunkards upon ale prepare for a speedy ossification of the heart, and must expect a sudden death. Newly distilled whiskey and other liquors of the like nature are more inflammatory than spirits which are matured by age. Immoderate wine drinkers may live perhaps longer than the immoderate drinkers of liquors highly alcoholic. But their estate is sooner wasted. Wretchedness and poverty of course sooner come upon their families. The example which they set, moreover, may in appearance have less of what is odious and horrible in it; but for that very reason it is likely to do the more mischief to others.

Intoxication, and all approach toward it, in all its stages, from whatever liquor it proceeds, is deleterious to body, mind, and outward estate. There may be some differences and some gradations in the mischief done by inebriating liquors; but in a mere question of *duty and conscience* they can scarcely be worth regarding. In cases of a *moral* nature, of religious duty, the question is not simply, in most cases not at all, whether a thing is *more* or *less* evil, but whether it is *evil*, and therefore to be avoided.

Nothing can be more certain, than that intoxication, in all its gradations from the lowest to the highest, *is evil moral and natural*. Can it be lawful then for me to incur this evil by the use of any liquor whatever, so as in any degree to intoxicate myself? Plainly it cannot.

Now if wine be an intoxicating liquor, (as all must know, who know any thing of its nature, or who are aware that most of our fashionable and common wines are nearly one half as strong as brandy,) then why is it not as wrong for me to use wine so as to produce any degree of intoxication, as it is to produce the same effect by any other liquor? Is it possible to make any difference here as to the *principle* which is concerned, that will amount to any thing worthy of serious notice in a *moral* point of view?

The true and fundamental principle then, of all Churches, and of all the real friends of temperance, would seem to be, that *the frequent or habitual use of all liquors which can produce intoxication is to be avoided*. All that comes short of this fails of reaching the essential point to be aimed at. Surely it will be conceded that the grand object of all temperance measures must be to put a stop to intemperance, and not merely to discuss the niceties of difference between one intoxicating liquor and another. Can any thing effectually do this, but to refrain from the frequent, the habitual, or excessive use of all liquors, whatever may be their specific name or nature, which contain sufficient alcohol to produce intoxication, when drunk in any quantity that we can well suppose men capable of drinking? If this be not a principle plain, simple, and fundamentally essential to the ultimate objects of all temperance societies which are thorough, I confess myself unable to see what radical and effectual principle can ever be established.

On any other grounds do we not contend with *names*, rather than with *things*? On any other ground what do we, except proscribe certain liquors because they have an odious name; while we admit the use of

others which produce the like or the same effects, because they are called by a name that has not yet become reproachful?

It will doubtless be said in answer to this, that the use of wine is proved by experience in wine countries not to be attended with the same hazard as the use of ardent spirits. It has often been asserted that persons do not as readily become intemperate by the use of wine as of ardent spirit, and that in case they do, its effects are much slower than those of distilled spirits, as to the destruction of health and life.

The first of these assertions, however, is matter of controversy.—Witnesses who have visited wine countries have of late been found to differ in their testimony relative to this subject. All the wine countries in Europe carry on the manufactory of brandy as well as wine; so that the opportunity for becoming intemperate by the use of ardent spirit cannot there be wanting. That there are fewer drunkards, however, in France, Spain, and Italy, than in England and America, seems to be more generally conceded. But whether this is owing to the state of opinion and habit there, in regard to intemperance, or whether it is to be put to the score of wine being less adapted to create a thirst for inebriating liquors than distilled drinks, would seem, from the present state of evidence, to be a more doubtful question than has hitherto been generally supposed.

Dr. Hewit, the former agent of the American Temperance Society, to whom the cause which they advocate is so greatly indebted, visited France a short time since, on purpose to ascertain the real facts in respect to their habits of temperance. I beg leave to quote his own words, as descriptive of the result to which his inquiries led. 'We have heard it affirmed,' says he, 'that France is a wine-drinking, but still a *temperate* country. The latter is entirely false. The common people there are burned up with wine, and look exactly like the cider-brandy drinkers of Connecticut, and the New-England-rum drinkers of Massachusetts. If they do not drink to absolute stupefaction or intoxication, it is because sensuality with Frenchmen is a science and a system. They are too cunning to cut short their pleasures by beastly drunkenness; and therefore they drink to just that pitch at which their judgment and their moral sense are laid asleep, but all their other senses kept wide awake. This is the only satisfactory explanation of the strange inconsistencies of the French character. And this explains how, with all their characteristic volubility, they are ready for any crime which can be committed. Their minds are kept at the point of excitement, where they are ready for any thing of this kind, while, at the same time, they know their own interest too well to drink to absolute stupefaction. Hence the horrors of the first revolution.' (Cited in the tract called the Clinton Family, p. 151.)

Other testimony from highly intelligent and observing men it would be easy to produce, did the limits of this Essay permit; other testimony, I mean, which serves strongly to corroborate this statement.—But I readily admit that different views have often been laid before the public. On the whole, therefore, the judgment of a serious inquirer after the truth, in relation to the actual state of intemperance in the wine countries, must be in suspense, until we have some farther light. Variety of testimony may easily be accounted for, without any impu-

tation of partiality, or even of erroneous judgment. Witnesses who visited different places in the wine countries, have seen different habits prevailing among the people in regard to the matter of intemperance, and have therefore given us different accounts, which seem, at first view, to contradict each other, but which in reality do not.

At all events the advocates for using wine as a common drink have no right, in the present state of the question respecting wine countries, to assume the fact that the people in them are unusually temperate, and to build upon such an assumption. More satisfactory testimony in their favor is needed, before this can safely and fairly be done.

But there are other questions of great interest, in respect to wines, some of which it is indispensable that we should here notice.

Medical men, so far as I know, seem to be satisfied that drunkenness by wine is less deleterious, in some respects, than drunkenness by ardent spirit. It is, as it would seem, the more general opinion among them, that the alcohol in wine is so modified by the other substances with which it is associated, as to be less inflammatory than that which is contained in distilled spirits. Hence the conclusion made by not a few very sensible and well-informed men among them, that there is much less need of opposition to the drinking of wine, than to that of ardent spirit.

That there is some foundation for such an opinion, one can scarcely doubt. That it has been carried much farther, however, than facts will warrant us to carry it, is what I verily believe, and shall now endeavor to show.

One reason why mere ardent spirit mixed with water produces a strong sensation and great excitement in the stomach, is, the imperfect mixture which it undergoes, for the most part, before it is drunk. But let the mixture be completely made, and the difference between water with ardent spirit and wine of the same strength, is scarcely if at all perceptible.

As this is a fact of great importance in the present inquiry, and as it has often and even generally been otherwise represented, I must produce my voucher for such an assertion.

Mr. Brande, of England, one of the most celebrated practical chemists of the present day, has analyzed spirituous liquors and wines to a greater extent, as I apprehend, than any other man now living.—From him comes the analysis to the number of fifty-eight different liquors, which is fully exhibited on the first leaf of the seventh Report of the American Temperance Society. Early in his labors of this nature, so long ago as the year 1812, this distinguished chemist read an *Essay before the Royal Society in London*, an extract from which I now beg leave to make, as having a very important and (as it seems to my mind) decisive bearing upon the point before us.

‘It has been frequently asserted,’ says he, ‘that a mixture of alcohol and water, in the proportions I have stated them to exist in wine, would be much more effectual in producing intoxication, and in the general bad effects of spirituous liquors, than a similar quantity in wine itself. *But this is true to a very limited extent only.* When brandy is added to water, it is some time before the two liquids perfectly combine; and with alcohol this is more remarkably the case; and then the mixtures are warmer to the taste, and more heating, if taken in a state of imperfect union, than where sufficient time has been allowed for

their perfect mutual penetration. I have also ascertained that *distilled* Port wine tastes stronger and is more heating than in its original state ; and that those qualities are unimpaired, and the wine reduced nearly to its original flavor by the addition of its acid and extractive matter.*

‘ With Claret and some other wines, containing less alcohol and being more acid than Port, these circumstances are more readily perceived. Lastly, *if the residuum afforded by the distillation of one hundred parts of Port wine be added to twenty-two parts of alcohol and seventy-eight of water, in a state of perfect combination, THE MIXTURE IS PRECISELY ANALOGOUS, IN ITS INTOXICATING EFFECT, TO PORT WINE OF AN EQUAL STRENGTH.*’

Allowing the correctness of this statement, which, so far as I know, has not been controverted, it follows, that alcohol and water of equal strength with wine, mixed with the residuum of wine obtained by distilling away all its fluid parts, produces the very same intoxicating effect as the wine itself of equal strength would, before its distillation. It may still be true, and probably is, that the residuum in question produces some modifying effect upon the alcohol and water mixed with it. Any nutritious substance, milk, bread, fruit, any thing which employs the digestive organs, seems in a greater or less degree to modify the action of alcohol. Every one who has had experience, knows that alcoholic drink taken upon an *empty* stomach will produce much more excitement and disturbance of the system, than when taken with a meal, or even with a small quantity of food. So far as the *nutritious* substance of the grape is incorporated with wine, so far it may serve, and doubtless does serve, to modify the alcohol which the wine always contains, when it has been fermented.

But with all the allowances which are to be made on the ground just stated, can there be any *important* MORAL difference between the action of the alcohol in wine upon the human system, and pure alcohol mixed with a quantity of water sufficient to reduce it to the same strength?—Mr. Brande says respecting this very point of difference, that *it is true in a VERY LIMITED extent only.* The experience of careful observers will decide, as I must think, in the same way. The writer of this in early life was accustomed, by direction of physicians, to drink alternately a small quantity of wine or brandy every day, on account of the feeble state of his health. He never perceived any sensible difference in the action of the alcohol in the two liquors, when taken in the same quantity as to their respective strength. The difference generally believed in seems to arise principally if not entirely from the fact, that wine is more usually drunk *with* or *after meals*, especially full ones.—The entire effect of that which is drunk late in the evening is in general not well observed, inasmuch as sleep soon succeeds the drinking of it.

We may allow, then, that physicians have some foundation for the opinion, that the action of alcohol in wine is modified by its mixture

* Mr. B. evidently means by ‘distilled Port wine,’ the liquor that is obtained from it by distillation until all the fluid part is drawn off. The qualities that are ‘impaired,’ by mixing this liquor again with the residuum which is found after distillation, are ‘warmth to the taste and a heating quality.’ In other words, the wine in its *original* state is less heating than the liquid distilled from it, if this be drank by itself.

with substances that come from the grape, which are of a nutritious and digestible nature, for in the like manner the action of pure alcohol and water may at any time be modified by any species of nutriment.— But now, for the *substance* of the matter—is there any *important* difference between alcohol itself in *wine*, and the same alcohol in *water*? Mr. Brande, an excellent authority on such a question, says there is not; experience, the experience of nice practical observers, as I verily believe, will agree with his decision.

Supposing now this ground to be correct, the *moral* question as to the frequent or habitual use of wine, remains the same for *substance* as the question respecting the use of brandy and water, or alcohol diluted in any way, so as to be of the same strength with wine. And if it be said, as I have already intimated it is, that the effects of drinking wine are less rapid and fatal to health and life, than those of drinking ardent spirit; we may allow that there is some foundation for this remark, (for doubtless there may be,) and yet is there difference enough between the two things to make the one *lawful* and the other *unlawful*? Stimulating the system habitually in any way with alcohol, whether in wine or any other drink, cannot possibly, if we credit the best physicians, be otherwise than injurious to the health of body and mind. It is therefore an offence against the laws of our nature; and consequently against the will of that God who ordained them. One may truly say, by way of illustration, that to put a man unjustly to death by *burning* him alive, is an *aggravated murder*; but to *drown* him without any just cause, although this is putting him to a lenient death, is still a *murder*. Habitual drinking of wine, then, may be less deleterious, and in some respects less criminal than the habitual drinking of ardent spirit; but does it therefore follow that stimulating with wine in such a manner is not really evil in the sight of God?

Let us look at this subject, however, in a little different point of view. For the sake of argument, we will concede that alcohol in wine is considerably modified and softened, in consequence of its combination with various matters that are extracted from the grape and combined with it. Yet, after all, the advocates for moderate wine drinking cannot help admitting that there is active alcohol enough remaining in all wines of which we have any knowledge, to produce intoxication.— Facts place this beyond all possibility of doubt. The modification, then, can be only *partial*. Men may and do become drunk with wine. As to that part of alcoholic action, then, which still remains after all the modification that we can with any degree of probability admit, what are the advocates of temperance to say? The most that can be truly alleged is, that a native wine of fifteen per cent. alcohol, as we may say for the sake of example, becomes, by being mixed with substances derived from the grape, analogous in its effects, in all important respects either physical or moral, to alcohol and water, or brandy and water, of strength a little inferior to the apparent strength of the wine. I see not how we can, in consistency with plain and certain facts, possibly make any thing more or less than this out of the whole matter. The alcohol in wine is still sufficiently strong to make men drunk, place the *modification* of its action at just as high a pitch as you please. Facts then can never be set aside, after all; and while it is a fact, that men intoxicate themselves continually upon wine, and do the same thing

with ardent spirit, all that remains to be said, is, that drunkenness on wine is less pernicious than that upon ardent spirit. But this, again, is what has never yet been *satisfactorily* shown; and I may add, what is not likely to be established. Where men are dyspeptics, (and most hard drinkers become so of course,) the *acid* that is in wine occasions far more grievous and distressing consequences to the health of the wine-bibber, than the intemperate drinking of brandy occasions. We may appeal to the severe head-aches that nearly always follow intoxication by wine, which are far less frequent among those who are addicted to brandy or rum.

Advocates, then, for the moderate drinking of wine, are bound to show us some way in which we can escape from the conclusion that wine drinkers are alcohol drinkers. Admit all the modification they plead for, and when all is done, there is sufficient alcohol left which is active and intoxicating, to render wine objectionable. Can a temperate man consistently indulge himself habitually in the drinking of such alcohol? This is a fair statement of the case, even on their own grounds; and yet the necessary conclusion from it is such as is enough to make the frequent or habitual drinking of wine revolting to every thorough-going advocate of temperance.

But there is still another view of this subject which must now be taken, before we can be prepared to advance to the ultimate object of our present inquiry. I have all along spoken of wines, without any reference to the *actual* state or condition of them as used in our country.

It is a fact well known at present, and too generally conceded to need any proof here, that all the wines of our country, (excepting merely a few casks brought from abroad by the special order of a small number of individuals,) are mixed with brandy or other ardent spirit. No doubt seems now to remain, that by far the greater quantity of what is sold and drunk as wine in the United States, is manufactured in the midst of us, in a great variety of ways, and often by the incorporation of deleterious substances. It is a well known practice, moreover, of all the manufacturers of wine abroad, where it is made from the grape, to add brandy to it, in order to prepare it for exportation.— This is thought to be the only way in which it can be kept from becoming acid; and indeed it is the only successful way which seems yet to have been discovered. Hence no *pure* wine can ever be obtained in this country, by importation from abroad, except by special order and great pains taking to prevent its being brandied. The higher wines have usually from eight to ten per cent. of alcohol added, i. e. one gallon of brandy at least for every five of wine; and the lower ones a like proportion, in respect to their original strength. No native wine has yet been analyzed which yields more than from fourteen to sixteen per cent. of alcohol. Few, if any, fall below ten per cent. of alcohol in their native state, i. e. even the lower wines are in general about one fifth as strong as brandy.

What then is the actual condition in which these wines, yielding in their native state from ten to sixteen per cent. of alcohol, come to be used by us? Almost without exception the wines in more fashionable use contain from eighteen to twenty-five per cent. of alcohol, i. e. they are from *one third* to *one half* as strong as brandy in its usual state and before dilution.

Such is the information communicated to the world by the result of Mr. Brande's experiments. I take great pleasure in adding, that the experiments of a skilful and excellent chemist of our own country, Prof. L. C. Beck of the city of Albany and state of New-York, accord in all important respects with the results in general of Mr. Brande.—By an analysis of nearly all the wines imported to this country, and of our own indigenous alcoholic drinks, Dr. Beck has, during the past year, laid the Christian public and all the friends of temperance under great obligations to him. The result of the whole of his protracted and very numerous experiments, is detailed and spread before the public in the *American Temperance Intelligencer*, extra, of May, 1834, printed at Albany by the noble temperance-corps there, who merit the thanks and blessings of all the friends of virtue and humanity throughout the world. The small variations from Mr. Brande's results, which appear in some of the results of Prof. Beck, are easily accounted for by the difference there is in the mode of manufacturing wines, every vintner putting in brandy according to his own judgment and taste, as is well known to be the fact. Beside this, different soils give to the same grape greater or less strength.

Of twenty-one wines (but not all of different sorts) analyzed by our countryman, none contained less than eighteen per cent. of alcohol, i. e. they were about *two-fifths* as strong as brandy, at the least, while most of them were nearly *half* as strong. The average strength of *twenty* of these wines was found to be about twenty-two per cent. of alcohol. Only Sauterne, Claret, and native American wine, were found to be comparatively weak; the first of these containing thirteen per cent. of alcohol, the second a little more than eleven, and the third nearly twelve, i. e. these lowest wines were at least *one-fourth* as strong as brandy. Of nearly the same strength is metheglin (10.57 per cent. ;) strong beer, 10.67; cider, nearly 5.

One very important result has come from the experiments of Mr. Brande and Prof. Beck. This is, that *the production of alcohol is now fully ascertained to be by FERMENTATION, and not by DISTILLATION.* The reasons of such a conclusion are briefly stated by Dr. Beck, and are for substance as follows:—

1. Alcohol is obtained from wines by distillation, *at the temperature of sixty degrees of Fahrenheit*; which of course precludes the idea, that alcohol is formed by the action of *heat* upon the elements existing in the fermented liquor.

2. Alcohol is *lighter* than wine. If it is formed by the process of distillation, and does not actually exist in the wine before it is distilled, then if it be added again to the residuum of wine after being formed by distillation, the same quantity by measure of wine would be lighter than before. But this is not the fact. The wine is of just the same specific gravity as before distillation. Of course the alcohol itself is just the same fluid before distillation as after it. Consequently it is not formed by distillation, but by *fermentation*.

3. Precipitate the coloring and extractive matters of wine by the subacetate of lead, and the pure alcohol may be separated from it without the process of distillation, viz. by the addition of dry subcarbonate of potash; in the same way that it can be obtained from whiskey, gin, brandy, &c.

These experiments settle, then, the very important question, *How is alcohol generated?* No doubt now remains that it comes from saccharine matter contained in fruits, vegetables, &c., and that it is always and exclusively the product of *fermentation*. Before fermentation, any quantity of wine, cider, &c, that can possibly be drunk, will produce no degree of intoxication, because alcohol is not yet formed. And so in respect to different grains and vegetables; any quantity of wheat, rye, barley, potatoes, &c, eaten as food, will produce not the slightest degree of intoxication. But let these substances undergo a process of fermentation, and then the alcohol is generated, and becomes a distinct and separate substance, which is capable of being disengaged from all its concomitant substances by distillation, or by another process as above related.

Alcohol, then,—and be the fact remembered by all the friends of temperance throughout the world—*alcohol is the same substance in wine BEFORE distillation as AFTER it*. It produces, therefore, as we might naturally expect, in all *important* respects pertaining to health or morals, the same consequences, if drunk often or to any degree of excess. It is not *distillation* which *makes* ardent spirits in any case; it is *fermentation*. The process of distillation gives to alcohol a separate form of existence, by educing it from its concomitant substances.

The reader will observe that I have expressed my views on this subject in a guarded manner. I do not aver that a given quantity of alcohol in wine will produce the same effect in all respects, as it will when drunk in a pure state. I concede the fact, that *some* modification is occasioned by the mixture of nutritive matter extracted from the grape. But wine, after all, does intoxicate to any and every degree; and therefore the alcohol in it, as far as it is not modified, produces the same deleterious effect as the alcohol in brandy or other ardent spirits. All that the modification by nutritive matter effects, is to render it necessary to drink a little more in order to produce an intoxicating effect, than would be requisite if the action of the alcohol were not in some degree modified. But how this can change the nature of the intoxicating effect in any *important* respect, as it regards either morals or health, I am quite unable to perceive. Getting drunk is neither more nor less than getting drunk; and becoming partially intoxicated is neither more nor less than becoming partially intoxicated; whether it be on wine or ardent spirit. It is the same substance, the same cause, viz. alcohol, which in both cases produces the same effect.

In view of such facts, what must we think then of the great, the long continued, the much insisted on distinction between alcohol in distilled spirits, and alcohol as it exists in wine? The substance of alcohol, as experiment shows with certainty, is the very same in wine that it is in brandy, gin, whiskey, or any of the fiery liquors. All that can be fairly said, is, that nutritious substances of the grape, as before observed, help in some small degree to moderate or mollify the action of the alcohol; but, as Mr. Brande has truly remarked, **TO A VERY LIMITED EXTENT ONLY**. Temperance societies and Churches have done well, no doubt, to wage war against the common use of *distilled* spirits.—They are an enemy with which, in this respect, no truce and no treaty should be made. A war of extermination is the only Christian warfare against such a use. But this war against distilled spirits has been

hitherto carried on, for the most part, in a kind of exclusive way ; and in this way only because, as I apprehend, the necessary light was not yet shed on this part of the subject. But now it seems to stand at last in open day, that distilled alcohol differs in no respect from alcohol in fermented liquors,* except that being in a good degree separated from other and extraneous substances when it is distilled, it is much stronger than in a diluted state. After all, however, it is *fermentation* which creates the alcohol itself. *Fermented* liquors, then, conceal this great enemy of human health and peace ; nor is he less deadly because he lies concealed in them. Distilled liquors taken with water and sugar, with milk, or with any modifying substance, can in no important respect be now shown to be more deleterious than fermented liquors which contain the same or at most but little more than the same quantity of alcohol.

It is time then for all our Churches, and all the friends of temperance, to look for the future at *things*, and not to be influenced in their measures by *names*. The public now know, or may know, on the subject of alcohol, what a short time ago they did not fully and satisfactorily know ; and what a few years since they did not know at all. Our measures, therefore, ought to keep pace with our light. *Fermented alcoholic* liquors should henceforth become the proper subjects of avoidance and prohibition, and not merely *distilled* ones. The enemy should be opposed and routed, whether in the open field or in ambush.

But here we shall of course be met with the allegation that has been often repeated : ' The Bible—the Holy Scriptures—allow, yea enjoin the use of wine. In a multitude of places they speak of it as in use among pious and excellent men of ancient days ; and the Giver of every good and perfect gift Himself required that it should be made a part of every daily oblation in the temple ; and the Lord of glory Himself has made it one of the elements of that holy supper, by which His sufferings and death are commemorated among all His faithful disciples.'

The truth of the facts now stated I do most fully and readily acknowledge. Whoever will open his Bible at Exod. xxix, 40, and Num.

* This fact is rendered certain from the process upon wine and brandy in order to separate the alcohol from each. The process is or may be the very same ; and the results in all respects the same, i. e. pure alcohol is obtained in the same manner. Now if there were any chemical combination of the substance of alcohol in wine, with other substances in it, and a modification were effected in this way, (as many seem to suppose,) then it would require some different agent to disengage the alcohol in wine from what is required to disengage it in brandy, which contains only *distilled* alcohol. But as one and the same agency or the same means disengages the alcohol in both cases, so there can be no mere combination of a chemical nature in one case than in the other ; and consequently all the reasoning about alcohol in wine, which is built upon assuming the fact that it is alcohol modified by chemical combination, and so as to become as it were another substance, falls to the ground, inasmuch as it has no facts to support it, but is directly contradicted by well known and certain facts. Alcohol is a *unity* wherever it exists, i. e. it is one and the same substance. It may be mixed with many kinds of ingredients, and the action of it modified by them ; but it is in itself always one and the same substance. And as this is now rendered *chemically* certain, it is in vain to build any longer upon the old assumption, that it is a substance in wine of a different nature from what it is in brandy and other ardent spirit.

xxviii, 7, will see that wine or strong drink was part of the daily offering to God, which was to be made by the priests. By consulting Mark xiv, 35, moreover, he will perceive that the cup which Jesus gave to His disciples, when He instituted the sacrament, contained *the fruit of the vine*, i. e. wine. That wine was drunk on sacramental occasions by the disciples of Christ at a subsequent period is quite clear also from 1 Cor. xi, 21, where the apostle sharply reproves some of the Corinthian Christians, because they intoxicated themselves at the holy supper.

On one other occasion, moreover, the Hebrews were permitted to use wine and strong drink. In Deut. xiv, 22-26, they are commanded to tithe all their increase or productions, and to eat of this tithe before the Lord, in the place where He shall appoint. But if the place where they live is so distant that they cannot conveniently carry up the tithe itself with them, when they go to present themselves before the Lord, they are directed to sell it, to carry the money with them, and to purchase 'oxen or sheep, or wine, or strong drink, or whatsoever their soul desireth,' and to eat and rejoice before the Lord.

The nature of this permission amounts to the same thing as a permission in our country, in those states where public thanksgiving is kept, 'to drink wine and such strong drink as the Hebrews used upon that day.'

There are two cases more which merit our attention. Jesus at the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee (John ii, 2-11) turned water into wine, for the accommodation of the guests who were present; and Paul directs Timothy to drink a little wine, on account of his frequent infirmities, 1 Tim. v, 23.

These are, I apprehend, all the decided cases of approbation or sanction to the drinking of wine, which the Bible exhibits. The case in which Wisdom invites her guests to a feast, (Prov. ix, 2-5,) and the injunction to give wine or strong drink to him who is ready to perish or is of a heavy heart, (Prov. xxxi, 6;) the case in which it is said that the Lord will make for His people a feast of fat things, and of wines on the lees well refined, (Isa. xxv, 6,) all range themselves under the same principles as the ones already specified. On special occasions of feasting, such as weddings, thanksgivings, and the like, there can be no doubt that the Jews were accustomed to drink wine, nor any doubt that they were permitted to do so; for the Scriptures do not speak of the temperate use of wine, on such occasions, with disapprobation.—But let it be noted, that *they no where command it*, except in cases where the restoration of lost health is concerned. Wine or strong drink (such as the Hebrews used) must be given to those who are of a heavy heart or ready to perish, i. e. to those who are sunk down and dispirited by disease; and Timothy is required by the apostle to take wine on account of his frequent infirmities; while the use of it at feasts is mentioned merely as a circumstance which was usually connected with them, and a thing which was not forbidden. On this ground, we find that Jesus was accused by the Pharisees of being a glutton and a wine-bibber, because He accepted of invitations to attend such meals or feasts as were prepared in special honor of Him. It would seem to be a natural conclusion, that wine was exhibited at those feasts; although there is no proof whatever that the Savior habitually

drank it when He attended them. The accusation that Jesus was a *wine-bibber*, in all probability, (may I not say, with certainty ?) had as little foundation as that He was a glutton. Both were made by the malignant Pharisees.

I must not quit the particular part of our subject which is now under consideration, without remarking that the very fact of wine being specifically mentioned in connection with *feasts* among the Hebrews seems to show very plainly that it was not a common or habitual, but a special drink among them. What writer in the English world, in describing a feast, would now think of mentioning that *bread* and *water* were exhibited at the table ? These are elements so common, or rather so universal, that the mention of them would be altogether superfluous. And so in the case of the Hebrews ; if wine had usually and habitually been placed on their tables, and was considered and treated by them as a common and necessary drink, how shall we account for the specification of it when their feasts are described ? Plainly it stands on the same grounds as the meats that are particularly mentioned, which are never common ones, but the *fatted calf*, *fat things*, *stall-fed beasts*, and the like. The very aspect of the Bible, then, in regard to the matter of drinking wine, shows that it was not a common but only a *special* drink, reserved for particular festive occasions, or else for the infirm and diseased. It can never be made out that Jesus, or His apostles, or any pious Christians of the primitive age, drank wine habitually. The most which it is possible to show from the Scriptures, is, that on special and extraordinary occasions they sometimes drank such wine as the grapes of Palestine afforded ; a liquor but little more than half as strong as the wines in common use among us. Even this, we shall see in the sequel, was in all probability much diluted.

No where, then, is the use of wine *commanded*, unless in some cases of broken health ; and even then we cannot consider it as a duty to drink it, provided we now have (as I doubt not we in fact have) better means of renovating our strength. Nothing can be more certain than that the use of wine for a great part of the dyspeptics at the present day would be exceedingly injurious, on the ground of the *acid* which it contains. That Paul judged rightly of Timothy's case, we need not be disposed to doubt. That his judgment in this case can be drawn in as a precedent for all cases of disease, or even of *stomachic* disease, it would be an egregious error and even folly to assert. The fact, moreover, that Paul felt himself obliged to give an absolute *mandate* to Timothy, in order to induce him to drink wine, shows that the latter had been accustomed rigidly to abstain from it.

Such then is the Scriptural view of wine, in respect to permitting, or not forbidding the use of it. Let us now look at the other side of this question, and see what cautions and prohibitions and threatenings the sacred writers have given and uttered, in order to prevent every gradation of abuse in respect to such a permission. In order to do this, I must request the reader to stop here, and deliberately to examine the texts to which I shall now refer him, and which (for the sake of brevity) I do not here transcribe at length, viz. Rom. xiii, 13 ; Prov. xxiii, 20, 21, 29-35 ; Eph. v, 18 ; Luke xxi, 34 ; 1 Thess. v, 6, 7 ; 1 Pet. iv, 3 ; Prov. xx, 1 ; Isa. xxviii, 7 ; Hos. iv, 11 ; Hab. ii, 5 ; Isa. xxviii, 1 ; v, 11-14, 22 ; Amos vi, 1-6 ; 1 Cor. v, 11 ; Deut. xxi, 18-21 ;

1 Cor. vi, 9, 10; Gal. v, 19-21. These texts contain the most awful warnings against intemperance; and they also exhibit wine as the principal instrument in occasioning intoxication. Especially was *mixed* wine, i. e. wine medicated by some fiery and stimulant substances, employed by intemperate persons for the purpose of becoming inebriated.

The amount of the whole Scriptural representation, then, seems to be, that while the use of wine or strong drink was enjoined in oblations to God, and while on the day of Jewish thanksgiving the Hebrews were permitted to drink it—while the Savior employed it in the institution of the sacramental supper, and sanctioned the use of it at a wedding feast, and possibly at other feasts, and Timothy was enjoined to use it for a medicinal purpose, yet, for the most part, the Bible is filled with warnings against it, and all excessive use of it is plainly prohibited under the highest penalty.

The lawfulness of *occasionally* using such wine or strong drink as they had in Palestine, is then established, as we must concede, on a basis which cannot be shaken so long as the authority of Scripture and the example of Jesus remain. Among intelligent and enlightened Christians there never can be any controversy on this part of the subject, so far as the simple fact is concerned. It is only the modifications and limitations which we are now called to examine.

But the settling of the principle already exhibited does not settle all the questions which may be asked, and which should be answered in a satisfactory way, if indeed they can be. These will bring us at last to the very point stated at the commencement of this Essay as the object of our inquiries; whither, indeed, all that has been said is designed at last to bring us.

The Hebrews, as it appears from the passage in Deut. xiv, 22-26, were permitted not only to use wine but *strong drink* also, on the day of their public thanksgiving at the close of their harvest seasons. We must stop a moment here, to inquire what was the nature of this *strong drink*, which the Scriptures so often mention in connection with wine, and which, as appears from Num. xxviii, 7, might be used as an oblation or drink-offering in the ritual of the tabernacle or temple service.

Jerome, who in the latter part of the fourth century spent twenty years in Palestine in order to prepare himself for translating the Hebrew Scriptures, has left on record a very explicit statement in respect to the Hebrew *shekhar* שכר, which is almost every where translated *strong drink*. He says, in his epistle to Nepotianus, 'In Hebrew, every drink which can intoxicate, is called *shekhar*; whether it is made of grain, or with the juice of apples, or with honey boiled down into a sweet and singular drink, or the fruit of the palm-tree (dates) is pressed into a liquor, and the water that is enriched by it is colored with stewed fruits.' Herodotus, one of the earliest Greek writers, (fl. 484 A. C.) testifies of the Egyptians; that 'they used a wine (*οινω*) made of *barley*;' Hist. ii, 67. Diodorus Siculus, who flourished a little before the Christian era, also testifies concerning the Egyptians, that 'if any region would not produce the vine, they were instructed to prepare a drink from barley, which was *not much inferior* to wine in fragrance and strength;' Lib. i, De Osiride. That the orientals in general were accustomed to make an intoxicating drink from *dates*, is well

known, and indeed is quite certain, from the fact that the Arabic word *sakar* سكر the same as the Hebrew word already quoted above, signifies *date wine* or *strong drink*.

From these express and altogether intelligible testimonies, it is plain that the word rendered *strong drink* throughout the Scriptures does not signify a liquor *more* intoxicating than wine, but *less* so in general. None of the substances with which it was made, afford so much alcoholic matter in their juices as the grape; and with the process of distillation the Hebrews evidently were not acquainted. Hence, when drunkards were desirous of highly stimulating liquors, they put in them peppers and various aromatics, or myrrh, in order to increase their stimulating power. Had they been acquainted with distillation, this would have been unnecessary. Moreover, Diodorus expressly says, as above, that the liquor (οινος) which the Egyptians obtained from barley, was inferior in strength to the wine, as doubtless it must be; and the same is true in respect to the *shekhar* or strong drink made from all the substances which Jerome mentions.

Wine itself and all intoxicating drinks may be included, and perhaps sometimes were included under the general name *shekhar*, שֶׁכָּר, but in nearly every instance in the Hebrew Scriptures wine is mentioned separately from *strong drink*. The original and simple meaning of *wine* and *strong drink*, as used by the sacred writers, is *wine and all other liquors that have an intoxicating quality*. But wine was evidently the strongest, and therefore it is mentioned first.

We can now see why the Hebrews were permitted, on their thanksgiving day, to use *strong drink* as well as wine; and why they were permitted to present this, as well as wine, in the drink-offerings made to the Lord, Num. xxviii, 7. Our translators needed not (as they have done) to render *shekhar strong wine* in this passage; and probably they would not have so done, had they understood the true nature of the liquors which it designates.

No intoxicating drink, then, existed among the Jews, which was as strong as wine; wine itself among them was never brandied, for the art of distillation was unknown; and the only substitute for ardent spirit was stimulating wines made by the infusion of aromatic and other substances of a stimulant nature. The danger then of intoxication was evidently much less among the Hebrews than among us; and much less than it now is in wine countries, where the distillation of brandy is constantly carried on.

From these important facts we may gather a reason why less caution was used in regard to permission to drink wine, than most temperate men now feel it expedient to use, in regard to drinking our wines, or our ardent spirits. But the utmost extent to which we can gather any express permission from the Scriptures to drink even native wine is, as we have seen, that it may be drunk on a day of feasting or thanksgiving, at a wedding, for infirmities of body, and at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The habitual and common use of it cannot be fairly deduced from any such permissions or customs as these; but rather the contrary.

I admit that drinking wine on all these occasions may be abused.—It was so by the Corinthians, at the very table of the Lord. But all

abuse of it, all drinking so as in any degree to become intoxicated, every one will admit to be most solemnly and strictly forbidden by the Scriptures. Indeed were the drinking of intoxicating liquors limited to the few occasions where the drinking of pure wine, or a liquor less intoxicating, has received the sanction of the Scriptures, there would be little occasion indeed for temperance societies or temperance efforts in the world. Men could hardly form a taste for spirituous liquors from such a use of wines as that under consideration.

But there are other questions still to be discussed. It must be admitted of course, by all who have any knowledge of ancient wines, and of the state of those in common use among us, that the ancient ones were not so strong by from one third to nearly one half as ours. After all this abatement of the comparative strength of ancient wines, the question may still be asked, and one of much interest it is, Did sober and temperate men among the ancients use wine, such wine as they drank which had but from ten to fourteen or fifteen per cent. of alcohol in it, in its simple state, unmixed with water; or did they mingle it with more or less of water, so as to reduce its strength before they drank it?

This question has a highly important bearing on the answer which should be given in respect to the kind of wine that ought to be exhibited and used at the Lord's table. If it can be shown, that Jesus and His disciples did in all probability, at the original institution of the Lord's Supper, *drink wine that was mixed with water*, most readily should the friends of temperance avail themselves of their example, and remove a reproach which is not now unfrequently cast upon the present mode of celebrating this ordinance.

What the general custom among all sober men of heathen Greece and Rome was, we have abundant assurance from the testimony of their own writers.

The Athenians had a tradition, as Philochorus cited by Athenæus relates, (Deipnos. ii, 7,) that Amphictyon king of the Athenians was first taught by Bacchus himself, to temper wine by mixing it with water; on which account he dedicated an altar to that god, under the name of *Orthius*, (ὀρθιος,) *upright*, because from that time men began to return from entertainments *sober* and *upright*, ὀρθοί. The same king is reported to have enacted a law, that only wine tempered with water should be drunk at entertainments; which law, when it fell into neglect, was revived again under Solon the great lawgiver of the Athenians.

The very name of the goblet among the Greeks, *crater*, (κρατήρ,) implies that it was a vessel where *mixture* was made; for this name is derived from a verb which signifies *to mix* (κράω.) Accordingly, the poetess Sappho represents Mercury as mingling ambrosia in a *crater* or goblet; and Homer represents wine as *mingled* in a crater for kings to drink; Athenæus, Deipnos. x, 7.

The proportion in which wine was thus mingled with water, varied according to the different taste of guests and the customs of different regions. Thus Athenæus, who in his tenth book has discoursed at large on the subject of mingling wines, and presented quotations from many ancient authors, represents Archippus as saying, in his Amphitryon, 'Who of you has mingled ἰσὺν ἰσῶ?' i. e. who has mixed an equal quantity of water with the same of wine? Hesiod directs to mix *three*

parts of water with *one* of wine. Anasilas, in his Nereus, says, 'I never drink *three* parts water and *one* of wine,' thus alluding to the mixture usually practised, and desiring for himself stronger liquor.—Alexis, in his Nurse, says, 'It is far better to use *one* part of wine and *four* of water;' i. e. better than to use a mixture of equal parts wine and water. Diocles says that *four* parts should be water and *two* wine. The poet Ion says that Palamades prophesied to the Greeks who were going to the siege of Troy, that 'their voyage would be prosperous, if they should drink *three* cups with *one*,' i. e. three parts of water and one of wine; a notable and expressive testimony in favor of temperance. Nichocares states the desirable proportion to be *two* of wine and *five* of water. Amerpsias and Eupolis state the same; as does Hermippus also in his Dii. Anacreon mentions *two* parts of water and *one* of wine, as the desirable mixture; and he calls the drinking of mere wine a *Scythian* practice.

Such is the statement of Athenæus, a writer who was very learned, and lived near the close of the second century; and it is replete with interest. The last hint which he has given us from Anacreon leads me to remark on the meaning of the Greek phrase, *to act like a Scythian*, (ἐπισκυθίσαι.) By this they designated the drinking of undiluted wine, thereby denoting that to do so was *playing the part of a barbarian*. This shows, beyond all question, what the usual practice among sober men must have been in Greece, i. e. that they did not drink wine unless it was mixed with water, and its strength in this manner reduced.

Athenæus moreover states that among the Locrians the drinking of pure wine was a capital crime, unless it was done for a medical purpose. Among the Massilians, women were forbidden to drink wine. Such was the case also at Miletus. Among the Romans, no slave, and no women of the higher ranks, nor any boys or youths of the same rank before they were thirty years of age, were permitted to drink wine.

Beside these facts from Athenæus, we have others of the like nature. Homer states that the dilution of Maronean wine was with twenty measures of water; and Hippocrates directs that not less than twenty-five parts of water be added to one of Thasian wine. The Romans exhibited hot water in the winter, and cold water in the summer, in order to dilute the wines which they drank at their tables.—Juvenal calls the waiter at the table, *calidæ gelidæque minister*, i. e. the waiter for hot and cold water. Lucian, in describing the Greek feasts, says, that 'wine was set on the table, and water made ready, both hot and cold;' in Asino. 7. See Henderson on Wines, p. 98 seq.

Such then was plainly the custom among all sober and temperate Greeks and Romans. To drink undiluted wine was *to play the barbarian*. Athenæus says of the drinking songs of Anacreon, that he *feigned* them, for he lived in a temperate manner himself; Deipnos. x, 7.

Were the Hebrews equally sober and temperate? In other words, Was temperance as popular and practised as much among the worshippers of Jehovah, as among nations who worshipped Bacchus and Venus?

We might almost assume the fact that it was; but still we will not.

One thing is certain, viz. that the Hebrew laws denounce intemperance in terms the most severe and awful. Sober and temperate men, therefore, must have an unusual abhorrence of it. Would they then, at their feasts either sacred or ordinary, *play the Scythian*, i. e. drink undiluted wine, and thus incur the danger and shame that result from intoxicating gratification?

I ask not what drunkards did among the Hebrews; for there can be no doubt that they procured, as they almost always do, the strongest liquors they could obtain. But our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles are not to be associated with intemperate men, in any respect. It is not supposable that they did that which, as even nature taught the Greeks and Romans, was immoral and barbarous, viz. to drink undiluted wine.

I am aware of some difficulties in developing the customs of the Hebrews with respect to wine, because of the language employed by the writers of the Old Testament in relation to this subject. We have often the image presented of strong drink or wine *mingled*, i. e. mixed with drugs of a stimulating and inflammatory nature, and wo is threatened to those who indulge in this practice; Isa. v, 22. But there is a different *mingling* of wine, as I apprehend, spoken of in Prov. ix, 2-5, where eternal Wisdom is represented as having prepared her feast, and *mingled her wine*. That the mingling, in this case, is with water or milk, seems evident from Cant. v, 1, where the spouse says, 'I have drunk my wine with my milk;' and Isa. lv, 1, where every one that thirsteth is invited to 'come and buy wine and milk without money and without price.'

How can it comport now with the laws of rational interpretation, to suppose that eternal Wisdom invites her guests to a banquet, where such wine as only drunkards use has been prepared for them? The Greeks and Romans would cry out against such an interpretation and say, This is representing the wisdom of God as inviting men to *play the Scythian*.

Among sober and temperate people, then, throughout Greece, Rome, and Palestine, we may take it as well established, that wine was drunk only in a *diluted* state, diluted with water hot or cold, or with milk.—Did the Savior and His disciples depart from the usual rules of sobriety and decency, when commemorating, for the first time, the Lord's Supper?

To ask the question seems to be nearly equivalent to answering it. If on common occasions men could not drink unmixed wine without incurring the reputation of being intemperate and of acting like barbarians, would the Savior and His disciples, convened under circumstances of the deepest sorrow and distress, have indulged in unusual and even indecent drinking? The supposition is revolting and even odious. It is utterly incongruous with their character and their circumstances.

Nor can the drinking of undiluted wine on that occasion be at all compared with such a practice at the present day, in order to show that it could not have been indecorous. Ardent spirits have usurped the place among us of undiluted wine among the ancients. What should we think of a Church, then, who should now use pure *brandy*, in celebrating the Lord's Supper? We should be filled with horror and

distress. And as verily so, I must believe, would the primitive disciples have been filled with them, if the proposal had been, in the midst of the deepest sorrow and distress, to indulge in a potation which none but revellers ever indulged in. Some now think pure wine a moderate and temperate beverage, because they always compare it in their minds with undiluted ardent spirits. But the Hebrews could make no such comparison. Undiluted wine, or wine mixed with stimulating drugs, was the most intoxicating liquor of which they had any knowledge; consequently a proposal to drink these unmingled or undiluted, at a religious feast, must have been just as revolting to them, as it would be to us to make use of brandy at the Lord's Supper.

We are approaching near to the final issue of our inquiries, 'Is it the duty of the Churches to make use of fermented [alcoholic] wines in celebrating the Lord's Supper?' One thing we may truly say, in answering this question, which is, that Christ and His disciples have left no direction or *command* to make use of strong alcoholic wines.—As to their example, it certainly cannot go to show the propriety or lawfulness of using artificial and *brandied* wines at the Lord's table; which most Churches are known at present to do. In respect to pure wine, moreover, if it can be had, there is not even a distant probability, as we have already seen, that it was drunk at the table by Jesus and His disciples, without being reduced by water. Why should we depart now from their example? If we must use *wine* at the sacramental table, then let us imitate, as nearly as possible, the original use of it; and this, as we have seen, could not have been wine drunk without any reduction by water; at least no probability of this kind can be made out.

The question has been asked, 'Is it *necessary* to employ wine at all at the table of the Lord?' To which I would answer, It is not *necessary*;* for wine was chosen as the representative of one of the natural aliments of the body, viz. drink; by which is symbolized the necessity of our souls' being nourished by faith in the blood of Jesus. It is a natural emblem, even from its color, of that blood. *Necessary*, however, to symbolic use, it plainly is not. The Lord's Supper might be celebrated without it, in like manner as we dispense with celebrating it in an upper chamber—with lying down—with unleavened bread—and with other things of the like nature. But still I do not think, with some of my Christian brethren, that it is *expedient* to dispense with wine at the table of the Lord. The custom of using it may be so managed, that no reproach, no difficulty, no danger will come to the Church or to religion in consequence of it.

Let me now, before I close, present the whole subject in a plain and summary way, and then appeal to the heart of every disciple of Christ, as to his duty in respect to the matter before us.

* We are inclined to dissent from the professor on this point, as, if it had not been the most proper element for the purpose of commemorating the death of the Savior, He certainly would not have selected it, as water or any other liquid was at hand, and therefore might have been used by our Lord on this solemn occasion, had He considered it equally suitable. We think we might dispense with *water* in *baptism* with as much propriety as we could *wine* in the *sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. But with this exception, the above Essay has our most hearty approbation, and we therefore earnestly commend it to the serious consideration of our readers.—ED.

All intemperate drinking, all intoxication from the highest to the lowest degree, is sin. All use of any liquor that has an intoxicating quality, so as to produce intoxication in any degree, is therefore a sin ; and consequently it is forbidden by the Scriptures and by the laws of our nature. Alcohol, which is the intoxicating quality in all drinks that inebriate, is in no sense and never the product of *distillation*, but always and only of *fermentation*. All fermented liquors, then, that have any intoxicating quality, have in them one and the same intoxicating ingredient, viz. alcohol. Distillation merely separates this from other concomitant substances ; it never produces it. Alcohol, then, in wine and brandy is just the same substance. The only difference in its effects is, that in wine it is somewhat concocted and mollified by the nutritious substances of the grape which are mixed with it. But this difference, in a *physical* or *moral* respect, does not seem to be worthy of any very serious notice. Ardent spirit can be mollified by sugar and water, or by milk, or by food in the like manner, and to a purpose quite as effectual.

A consistent Christian and advocate of temperance must declare war against all intemperance in every form. He contends not against *names* merely, but against *things*. To him it matters not whether a man becomes intoxicated on wine, metheglin, or any other drink which produces this effect. The *effect itself* is the great point in question ; and this, let the cause be named as it may, is always a sin. What matters it, whether the same enemy (for the same it is) lurks under the garb of pure alcohol, of brandy, wine, or any other liquor ? It is always one, and only one, and the same thing, viz. *alcohol*. Intoxication is not the less a sin, because it is brought on by indulgence that is surnamed decent or fashionable.

Beside all this, our wines are from one third to one half stronger than those of ancient times, because of the alcohol that is superadded. Yet in ancient Greece, Rome, and (as we have abundant reason for believing) in Palestine, wine was never drunk by sober and temperate persons in an undiluted state. It was *to act like a Scythian, to play the barbarian*, to drink it in such a state.

From all this it would seem to be quite certain that persons of such a character as the holy Savior and His disciples, and on an occasion of such deep distress as that when the Lord's Supper was first instituted, did not use undiluted wine. It follows then, that if the Churches wish to conform to their example, they should use only wine diluted ; and diluted to such a degree, when it is *brandied* wine, as to reduce it to the strength in which it was probably drunk at the table of the Lord.

It may perhaps be said, that the Christians at Corinth could not have intoxicated themselves on wine so much reduced ; as it is manifest they did, by wine drunk at the table of the Lord ; 1 Cor. xi, 21. But who will show us that men who could behave thus shamefully on such an occasion, did not drink their wine undiluted ? It is highly probable they did ; for intoxication could scarcely be produced in most persons by drinking ancient wine diluted by one half or two thirds of water.

Many individuals and Churches have been quite solicitous, of late, to obtain pure wine from abroad, i. e. wine without any brandy super-

added. I honor and commend the feeling which leads to such a measure. But after all, it is needless, as I view the subject. Wines manufactured at home, and above all, such as have *deleterious* substances in them, are to be shunned with horror, for fear of being poisoned. But wines that have merely the juice of the grape in them, with pure brandy added, are to all intents and purposes the same thing, so far as temperance is concerned, when the strength is reduced by *dilution*, as wines that are native and simple. The alcohol that is made by fermentation and is contained in undiluted wines, is just the same thing, so far as it goes, as the alcohol which is obtained by distillation.—Great pains and expense, then, are bestowed on the importation of pure wines, which, so far as the temperance question is concerned, appear to be needless. Due dilution by water settles all questions about conforming to *primitive* usage.

So far as the simple article of bodily health is concerned, pure wines may, and no doubt are, the best, if they can be obtained before they become acetous, and lose their life and relish. But the accomplishment of this is attended with many difficulties.

Why then, I ask with a deeper interest than ever, why should not our Churches follow what was so evidently the example of our Savior and of the apostles, in celebrating the Lord's Supper? If example is to be the ground of celebrating the rite as to the *mode* of its celebration, we have a plain and palpable one; and this would lead us, of course, to dilute our wines, until they are reduced to the same strength as that in which they were originally drunk at the table of the Lord. How great this reduction by water should be, must depend on the strength of the wine, and on the proportion in which it was originally diluted at the table of Jesus and the disciples. On such a point we need not be over scrupulous. The most favorite mixtures in Greece for drinking, was three parts water to one of wine, or five parts water to two of wine. Half wine and half water was deemed a mixture that savored of intemperance. If either of the other proportions be chosen, we cannot, in all probability, be far from the usage of Christ and His disciples. Brandied wines of course would require still more reduction, in order to bring them near to the original standard.

One evident advantage would follow from the practice now recommended. It would take away all opportunity of persons' becoming in any degree intoxicated at the sacramental table. Dreadful as the thought is, yet the deacons of our Churches well know, that there are not wanting persons who, at the table of the Lord, will drink deep of the consecrated cup which is offered to them. Reduced wine would prevent the partial intoxication in which they thus scandalously indulge.

Another serious benefit would result from the practice above recommended. The friends of intemperance now reproach Christians, because in their most sacred rite they do the very same thing which they condemn in the world, viz. drink undiluted wine. This reproach would be effectually removed, by following the primitive example of celebrating the supper.

Why then should not Christians—all the Churches—approve and adopt this example and practice? If they should, would the rite of the holy supper be deprived of any part of its significance as a symbol? Surely not. A symbol as significant as the Savior Himself made it,

is significant enough for our purposes. And can the presence of more *alcohol* in the wine drunk at the Lord's table add more of religious Christian significancy to the element that we drink? The very thought of this almost makes one shudder. It is revolting, if not absurd.—Why then should not sacramental wine be drunk *diluted*? The only answer that I can think of, is, 'Because some who approach the Lord's table love wine better when it is not diluted;' which, in my view, is an important reason why it should be diluted.

But if there be any Christian Churches, who are desirous to avoid every possible danger from employing even *diluted* wine at the sacrament, and who still prefer to employ wine, or rather *the fruit of the vine*, as one of the elements of the holy supper, they may employ unfermented wine for this purpose, made from native or foreign grapes. We know from Gen. xl, 11, that the ancient custom among the Egyptians was, to drink the juice of the grape immediately after its being pressed out of the fruit. In this state, no quantity that could be drunk would occasion intoxication. In this state, also, wine could be had, by preserving the fruit of the grape, at all seasons of the year. The *new wine*, so often mentioned in the Scriptures, does not mean this liquor, but wine *newly fermented*; which is then stronger than at any other time, inasmuch as none of the ardent spirit is dissipated. Age dissipates, in some measure, the alcohol contained in wine; because heat, at the temperature of sixty degrees will distil off the ardent spirit that is in it. It requires to be very closely kept, in order to prevent this effect.

The *practicability* of providing such a liquor as above described from grapes, even in climates where the vine does not grow, cannot be denied. The expediency of doing it may be safely left to every Church to judge for itself. The lawfulness of celebrating the sacrament in this manner, cannot scarcely be soberly called in question.

I take my leave of this whole subject, by placing it in the attitude in which Paul himself has placed a subject of the like, if not of the same nature. This holy apostle, the most enlightened Christian probably that has ever lived, when he declared that all distinction of meats was at an end, and that one kind of food was no more unclean than another, at the very same time most solemnly declared, that in case the eating of meat, i. e. of meat that had been offered to idols, should occasion his brother to offend, he would eat none while the world should stand; 1 Cor. viii, 13.

Here then is a great principle of Christian action established. *If any thing is not necessary to our comfort and happiness, but is only a matter of gratification to the taste, or one of convenience; and yet this thing is injurious to the moral interests, or wounding to the feelings and consciences of others, FROM THAT THING WE ARE BOUND RELIGIOUSLY TO ABSTAIN.* So Paul has repeatedly and most solemnly decided, in his epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians.

Nor has Paul merely laid down a general principle here. He has identified the very case with which we are at present more particularly concerned. He says, 'It is good neither to eat flesh, *nor to drink wine*, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak;' Rom. xiv, 21. Doubtless he did not mean, in this case, to prohibit wine at the sacramental table; for drinking it there gave no

offence to Christian brethren whom he had in his eye. It was the drinking it on other or ordinary occasions which he would abandon, and which he would that all others would abandon, when it became cause of offence or of stumbling.

Let all Christians then ask the simple question, Does the common use of wine cause others to stumble? Is that use *necessary*; or, in any important sense, of advantage? All well informed medical men are agreed, that water is the best and most healthful of all drinks.—Stimulus by alcohol, in all cases, is to be avoided by all who would most effectually promote health and avoid intemperance. One most striking and instructive fact fully confirms this; although we might easily appeal to a multitude of facts. The interest which the Greeks took in their public games, nearly all of which consisted of feats of bodily agility and strength, is well known to every person in the least degree conversant with the history of ancient times. A long time was usually spent in preparing for these contests; and the *gymnasts* (as they were called) who intended to enter the lists were trained with the greatest possible care, in respect to every thing which could in any way contribute to increase and confirm their physical powers. But this shrewd and discerning people *did not suffer their gymnasts to drink wine*; and they forbade it on the very ground, that *the highest point of physical power could be more effectually reached without it than with it*. When shall we learn as much, by all the lights of science, as these sons of nature learned without them?

With such facts before us, we may well come to the conclusion, that nothing *obliges* us, then, to drink wine often or habitually. And supposing that we might indulge in it on days of thanksgiving, or at wedding feasts, without sin, are we called to do this? Are we, in any sense, *obliged* to do it? Certainly not; and above all we are not permitted to do this where no duty calls us to do it, and where we know certainly that indulgence of this sort will injure the interests of the temperance cause, and lead the friends of intemperance to point to our example, and defend themselves by such an appeal. This they will do, so long as Christians go on in the way that many of them do go, in respect to the use of wine. The times are now such, the interests now pending are so important, that it is not possible for those who indulge in frequent use of wine to say that they do no injury by it. If it be *lawful*, IT IS NOT EXPEDIENT. The nature of the principle laid down by the apostle, and the great interests of humanity, benevolence, and reform, demand an entire abandonment of this practice.

For one, I feel bound frankly to say to my brethren who maintain the right and the expediency of a common use of wines, that their arguments do not satisfy me. They object to those who proscribe such a use, that their arguments would prove a great deal too much, and therefore that they prove nothing. They say that if alcohol is proscribed in every form, then we must not eat bread-corn nor fruits, nor most of vegetables; for all of them will yield alcohol.

But here they are plainly in an error, as to the conclusion which they deduce from their premises. Bread-corn and fruits will indeed yield alcohol; but they do not contain it. *Fermentation* is necessary in all cases to its production. Before fermentation, alcohol, in the proper sense of this word, no more exists in bread-corn and fruits, than

oak timber exists in an acorn. It is certainly true that an acorn will produce oak timber, if it be suffered to germinate and grow. But can we build houses and ships out of acorns? It is equally true, that grains and fruits will produce alcohol; but they must first be subjected to fermentation. Before this, any imaginable or possible quantity taken into the stomach, will produce no degree of intoxication. Any liquor made from grapes or apples will not produce any degree of intoxication, if drunk in any measure before fermentation. The materials then from which alcohol is made, are no more alcoholic in themselves, than an acorn is oak timber. Consequently all the extravagant conclusions, in this respect, which it is said may be deduced from the principles of those who oppose the common use of wines, are entirely without any basis for their support or any ground to justify them. Of course, all appeal to such argumentation is irrelevant and invalid.

Again it is objected to those views which I have been advocating, that the positions which I have taken are such, that they must necessarily exclude the common use of all liquors that have any degree of alcohol in them; and therefore they not only exclude the use of wines, but of cider, porter, ale, and even small beer. The consequence is, that these positions are taxable with *extravagance*.

But is this really so? Admitting the fact, that the premises which I have labored to establish are such as will afford the inference that all liquors which are in any degree alcoholic are to be avoided, is there any *extravagance* in such a position? We will allow, for the sake of argument, that the Scriptures are not explicit in relation to the question now at issue. Yet it does not follow, that the *spirit* of Scriptural precept would not demand the renunciation of all alcoholic drinks for common use. The Scriptures do not specifically and by name forbid forgery, nor arson, nor contraband trade, nor a multitude of other crimes. And why? Plainly because the state of society which existed when the Scriptures were written, did not and could not give birth to such crimes; consequently they did not come under the cognizance of the sacred writers. But has not the Bible, still, in requiring us to love our neighbor as well as ourselves, to do unto others that which we should in like circumstances wish them to do to us, and to submit to the laws of our country, prohibited all the crimes just named, and all others which are not specifically pointed out in the sacred records? This will be conceded. It does not follow, then, that because the Scriptures have not specifically forbidden the common use of all alcoholic liquors, that the spirit of the Bible does not require us to renounce them. The object of Scriptural prohibition or precept, is to establish the great *principles* of religion and morality, not to enter into a specific detail of particular cases.

I take it to be a sound and well established principle, that God has revealed His will by His *works* as well as by His *word*. That there are laws of our physical nature, which will demand and inflict effectual punishment for an offence against that nature, every one knows to be absolutely certain. One of these laws is, that alcoholic drink, taken in any shape, must disturb the natural and healthful exercise of our physical powers. There is no *nutriment* in alcohol. The human stomach refuses to digest it. It is not in the proper sense of the word appropriated by any part of the system. It penetrates the whole, and

is thrown off, at last, by the secretions and by insensible perspiration. It is therefore in itself, to all intents and purposes, a *poison*. Not an immediate and fatal one, I admit, unless taken in considerable quantities; but still, a gradual and subtle one. Nor is it any objection to this idea, that wine may be and is *medicinal*; for nearly all the poisons are now employed in the like manner. Any of them may, by habit, become so comparatively weakened in their force, that they may, for a long time, be daily taken. And such is the case with wine.—But as wine confessedly has alcohol in it, and as there are other weaker drinks which have alcohol in them, we may with propriety ask, What duty obliges us to swallow alcohol? Is our health and strength promoted by it? In common cases they certainly are not, but rather impaired. Water is of all drinks the most natural, salutary, and healthful. Why renounce it then? What duty, what prospect of real good, induces us to abandon it, and take to alcoholic drinks? To do so is an offence against the original laws of our nature; it is an offence against the best maxims for the preservation of health. Nothing can be more certain, than that if any alcoholic drink whatever be habitually taken, we can expect but little if any advantage from wine or any such beverage in particular cases of sickness.

Has not the Author of our nature, then, very plainly told us, that we should avoid the common use of any alcoholic drinks? For my part, I must say, that it seems to me to be written by the hand of God Himself, upon the very nature which He has given us. To say then that He has not prohibited the common use of such drinks, would be no more correct than to say that He has not forbidden such a use of opium as the Turks make, because no precept in the Bible can be found which recognizes and prohibits the use of opium.

If now, in addition to all this, it be true, as it certainly is, that no advocate for temperance can be thorough and effectual and also avoid the reproach of the intemperate, so long as he indulges in the habitual use of any alcoholic drink; if such indulgence serves, as it surely must, to keep in countenance intemperate wine drinkers or drinkers of ale and other liquors of the like nature: in a word, if common indulgence in any kind of alcoholic liquor injures myself and injures my neighbor, then God has forbidden such a use. That these positions are true, can, as it seems to me, be certainly made out to a candid mind; that the conclusion which is drawn legitimately follows, I am not able to doubt.

But here again it will probably be said that the argument against alcoholic drinks of all kinds, must prove too much, because it will prove that Jesus and His disciples, who drank wine, did partake of drink that was injurious, and which therefore was prohibited, in case the principle that I am defending be allowed.

The reader will observe, however, that my argument has, all along and throughout, been directed against the frequent or common use of alcoholic drinks. To say now, that because such a use must be injurious and therefore should be prohibited, is quite a different position from saying that an *occasional* use of wines and drink less strong is altogether prohibited. A poor man who supports himself and his family by his daily labor, may lawfully indulge in a dinner on thanksgiving day, if he eats temperately, which it would be quite unlawful

for him to indulge in every day in the year. All extremes in these and the like cases are to be avoided. An occasional and perfectly temperate use of liquors slightly alcoholic may be cheerfully and readily conceded, and yet the position, that the common use of them is injurious and therefore forbidden, may be strenuously maintained. There is no inconsistency at all in this. A poor man may lawfully wear a holiday suit of clothes on holidays, which it would be criminal for him to wear while engaged in his daily labor.

It never can be shown that Jesus or His disciples indulged in the habitual use of wine. It never can be rendered probable that they drank wine at all, except in a diluted state; and such wine as they drank, when diluted with three quarters or more of water, (which was as we have seen the probable reduction of it,) could scarcely be said, in any important sense, to be capable of injuring them when only occasionally and temperately drunk.

The gratification of *taste*, then, would seem to be the only thing which can be pleaded in favor of wine as a common drink. But this can never come, among sober and judicious men, to be considered as an object of serious importance. Is it not true that those who drink pure water instead of alcoholic drinks, enjoy their beverage quite as much as wine drinkers do? And then, if the gratifying of taste hurts myself, and endangers the safety of my neighbor, and is uncalled for by any duty whatever, can such gratification be lawful?

To sum up the whole case: the advocates of thorough temperance measures hold it not to be a *malum in se*, i. e. an evil or sin in itself, to drink wine occasionally. They do not come out against the practice on such a ground. They rather take the ground, that, since no duty calls them to the frequent or habitual use of any drink which is alcoholic—since such drinks of every kind, when often taken, injure rather than promote health, and afford occasion of stumbling to others; they are bound on the ground of expediency and out of regard to the public good, to refrain from all habitual or frequent use of any liquor that has alcohol in it. It is indeed only on sacramental occasions that a thorough disciple of temperance, at the present time, will feel disposed to taste of any liquor of this nature. Here, the example of Christ and His disciples would seem to give a sanction to the use of wine, which may justly remove all scruples respecting it. But even here, let the example be as exactly copied as possible. Let us not eat nor drink in such a manner as to bring on ourselves judgment or condemnation. Let us not exhibit such wine at the table of our Lord, as in ancient times would have been exhibited only at the tables of the intemperate or of bacchanalians.

In fine, it is our most serious and full persuasion, that if those who love the cause of temperance, and plead and exert themselves for it, do still continue the frequent or habitual use of any alcoholic drink, however slight the proportion of alcohol may be, then the great ends of the temperance reformation will, after all, be in the sequel defeated. As soon as distilled spirits are expelled from common use, the lower kinds of alcoholic drinks will be greatly increased. Ale and cider and wine will become so abundant that intoxication will be made as cheap by means of them as by ardent spirit; and such drinks being made reputable by the usage of temperate men, will be indulged in to all degrees

of excess by those who indulge in any degree of intoxication. Such is already beginning to be the case, particularly in regard to ale and strong beer. But who does not know that the beer drinkers of England are in all respects as degraded and wretched as the whiskey drinkers of our country?

By all that is benevolent and sacred, then, in the cause of temperance, I would beseech the advocates of it to pause, before they give countenance to the fatal consequences that will follow the upholding and encouraging of any alcoholic drink whatever, as one for frequent or common use. These consequences will not in the end be less deleterious to the interests of the community, in any point of view, than if it were deluged with wine and strong beer and cider: then repentance on the part of sober men, who have given countenance to such drinks, will be too late. The harvest will be past, the summer ended, and we cannot be saved.

Christian, whoever thou art, I counsel thee to look well to this matter, and most seriously to examine it. The great Head of the Church does certainly expect of His disciples, that they will do nothing which promotes the interests of intemperance, or keeps those in countenance who practise this vice. The gratification of *bodily appetite* will not avail thee, in the great day of account, as an excuse for a practice which keeps in countenance and encourages those who drink for the purposes of inebriation. Self-denial is that to which the Gospel calls thee. Its high and holy principles bid thee abstain from the very appearance of evil. If thou refusest obedience, thou must be answerable for the awful consequences.

Churches of the Lord Jesus, who celebrate the memorials of His dying love, follow the example of Him whose death you celebrate.—Come not to His sacred feast, and indulge in that which a sober Greek or Roman, even in a heathen state, would have pronounced to be an indecorous practice, worthy only of a people like the Scythians. Let your wine be *mingled*, like that which eternal Wisdom prepared for her guests. Thus may you eat and drink, discerning the Lord's body aright. Thus may your sacred rights be performed, without leading astray the weak, and without affording gainsayers any opportunity to reproach you. The end to be accomplished by such a reformation is worthy of your high and holy profession, of your fervent prayers, and of your best efforts.

ADDRESS

Delivered at the annual commencement of Dickinson College, July 16, 1835, by ROBERT EMORY, A. M., Professor of Languages.

THE spirit of inquiry, which has prevailed in reference to education, has already elicited such copious information on the subject, that some may be disposed to regard any farther discussion of it as useless. Were the productions of the pen and of speech designed only to *instruct*, there might be some ground for the opinion. Could we content ourselves to treat subjects of vital public importance like the mock discussions of the schools, in which the object is to see how much can

be said upon a question, we might admit that if all has not been said on the subject of education that was possible, at least there has been enough for the formation of our opinions, and the direction of our practice. But who does not know that after the public mind has been fully enlightened upon a topic, there still remains the more difficult, and not less important duty, of moving it to action.

The thrilling appeals which so often emanate from the sacred desk, are called forth not so much by the ignorance, as by the apathy of the people. Week after week we repair to the house of God, and hear from the same lips the same holy principles—principles which have perhaps been familiar to us from childhood ;—yet we think not the service tedious or unnecessary, because we are conscious that as yet the appropriate effect upon our life and conduct has not been produced.

It is for the same reason that we think that the subject of education cannot be too often presented for our consideration. Although much light has been thrown upon it, by the zeal and learning of those who have treated it, still their labors have not yet produced those practical results which constituted their only object. Parents still allow their children to be educated upon erroneous systems ; public seminaries still send forth pupils unqualified for the duties of private or of public life ; youth continue, for the most part, blind to their best interests, and are pressing their way, with indiscreet haste, to stations for which they are utterly incompetent. It is useless to discuss the best modes of teaching, or the best systems of discipline, while we have such abundant and conclusive evidence that, as yet, the very object itself of education is by many but little understood. Let us, then, devote a few moments to this inquiry :—*What is the proper aim of education?* It is an important inquiry. It intimately concerns all the relations of society ; the public, in their expenditures for the encouragement of learning ; the parent, in selecting the instructor of his child ; the teacher, in adopting his course of instruction ; the youth, in proposing to himself the proper object of his early efforts, and of his generous hopes ; all, all, are interested to be correctly informed upon a point in which error may lead to irreparable—to fatal consequences.

On such a question, I would not presume, before such an audience, to obtrude my own crude conceptions, unsupported, as they must be, by any length of experience. But though I may advance no new sentiments, and though I may defend those which have been heretofore advanced by no new arguments, still, I trust, that I shall secure the more humble, though not less useful end, of presenting to you the matured opinions of the wise and good, in such a light, that, while they cannot fail to meet the approbation of your judgment, they may obtain the active concurrence of your practice.

That education in itself is desirable, I shall not consume your time in attempting to prove. The superiority of intelligent over ignorant man ; of him, who, in point of mental culture, has been almost fitted for the society of superior spirits, over him who is removed from the brute only by the possession, not by the exercise, of different faculties, is a subject which no longer admits of discussion. No ! the question is not whether education is useful, but what kind of education is most useful. We conceive that in this case, as in every other which affects

the interests of man, the proper criterion of the utility of any object is, its tendency to promote his happiness. What then is the system of education that can best abide this test? Is it that which trains the youthful mind to habits of shrewd calculation, and sagacious planning for the accumulation of wealth? A Cræsus, in the midst of his countless treasures, could not extort from the Athenian sage an acknowledgment of his happiness. Is it that which sows the seeds of restless ambition, and creates an insatiable thirst of power? From 'Macedonia's madman' to the Corsican, the most successful aspirants have been as miserable as their most unfortunate competitors. Is it that which stores the mind with a mass of learning, undigested and unsuited to any practical purpose? The wise man of Israel has assured us, that he that thus increaseth knowledge, but increaseth sorrow. Is it that which exclusively fosters some already predominant faculty, adding the influence of art to that of nature, to stimulate it to an unnatural growth? The fate of genius, in all ages, when unsupported by judgment, has become a proverb of misfortune. No! neither distorted genius, nor barren learning, nor unlimited power, nor boundless wealth, are sources of real happiness, and therefore, neither the cultivation of the first, nor the acquisition of the others, is the proper leading object to be proposed in a course of instruction. What then is? It is *the cultivation, in just and harmonious proportion, of all the powers and faculties of man*. This alone can impart a complete and generous education: that which, to use the language of Milton, 'fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.'

Such a definition, it is obvious, must include the cultivation not only of the intellectual, but also of the physical and moral powers. And would that my limits permitted, or that my abilities enabled me to brand, with an appropriate stigma, the criminal neglect with which these have been treated. To depict in living colors the cruel folly of those, who, whether from misguided fondness, or blind devotion to fashion, bring up their children with feeble and sickly frames, to be the prey of lingering disease, or the victims of untimely death: or to denounce, with becoming indignation, the still more fatal thoughtlessness of those, who, while they train the body, and discipline the mind, leave the immortal spirit destitute of that moral culture, without which bodily vigor is pernicious and learning a curse. But I forbear. Leaving these interesting and momentous topics to other and abler hands, I confine myself to the single branch of intellectual education.

Here then we maintain, that however proper it may be in the diversity of human occupations, that a man should not waste his strength by vain attempts to pursue them all, but rather confine himself to whatever one may be best suited to his capacity, still this remark does not apply to that period of life which is devoted to education. Then the great aim should be, not to replenish, but to enlarge the capacity; not to prepare the student for any particular vocation, but to impart to him that mental vigor by which he shall be qualified for any station to which subsequent events may lead.

It is true, that, in such a course, there must be much positive information acquired, and the student will be more or less fitted for particular offices; but still these are not the objects, but only the accompa-

nying results : and so soon as any one of them loses this its appropriate secondary character, and assumes that of a principal, we have at once an education partial in its nature, and distorting in its effects. For, as he only is a perfect model of the human frame, who exhibits every member in symmetrical proportion ; as he only is a perfect moralist, who combines in his character every virtue ; so, he only is a perfect scholar, who has united in himself, and cultivated to their highest extent, all the attributes of mind.

The advantages for every pursuit in life of such an education, or as near an approximation to it as circumstances will admit, need but be stated to be acknowledged. Why is it that upon the occurrence of those changes which are so frequent in our day, whereby the current of public business without being diminished, is turned into new channels,—why is it that there is such an amount of private suffering ? Is it not because the unhappy subjects of it have received a sort of mechanical education, which fitted them for nothing but the routine of the particular business in which they had been engaged ? Who is the physician upon whom you would rely in the hour of danger ? Is it he who has merely stored his mind with the theories of others, and learned by heart the symptoms and treatment of every disease in the books ? or is it he, who, by more profound investigation, and more intense study than such plodding ever required, has attained so intimate a knowledge of the human constitution, that nature seems to have revealed to him, as to her favored priest, the mysteries of life and health ? Who is the advocate to whom you would intrust the defence of your dearest rights ? Is it he who, though familiar with the forms of every action, and the decisions of every case, is lost when out of the beaten track of precedent ? or is it he who has penetrated to the foundations of the law, and, from its profound depths, has brought forth principles whose application is as certain as the basis upon which they rest is unchanging ?

But it may be asked, What are the studies best calculated to afford this development and discipline of the faculties ? Of the various branches, each has in turn had its advocates, who have urged its claims, if not to exclusive, at least to pre-eminent attention. For one, I am as much opposed to ‘catholicons and panaceas’ in literature, as in medicine ; and I would as soon believe that all the diseases of the body can be healed by a single remedy, as that all the faculties of the mind can be trained by a single study. As then all the kingdoms of nature are made to furnish their contributions for the preservation of health and the protraction of life, so let every department of science lend its aid to the formation and perfection of the mental character.

We are not here then to balance the respective claims of the ancient or of the modern languages, of the natural or of the exact sciences,—to depreciate the one or to extol the other ; but, to assert the importance of each in its appropriate place.

When it is considered, however, that of these, the study of the ancient languages has of late been an especial object of attack, it may not be thought improper on this occasion to make a short digression, in order to test its value, by the principles which have been advanced.—Before we do so, however, it becomes us to remove an objection of a different character which has been urged against this study, and which,

if it be established, is of itself sufficient to condemn it :—we mean that which relates to the moral influence of the classics. We do not deny that there is much in the writings of pagan antiquity that is false in principle, and corrupt in morality, and which, if unguardedly imbibed, can hardly fail to vitiate the youthful mind ; but if, as should always be the case, judicious selections be made, and if whatever that is offensive even in these be made the subject of appropriate comment, we conceive that the effect, so far from being injurious, will be highly salutary. When does the worship of the only true God appear more rational than when compared with the absurdities of heathen mythology ? When do His character and attributes appear more glorious, than when He is contrasted with the contentious and libidinous deities of Greece and Rome ? Who can contemplate with such profound admiration, the pure principles and the glorious hopes of Christianity, as the classical scholar ? The humblest and most ignorant follower of the Cross, indeed, may look forward with joyful confidence to a blissful existence beyond the grave ; but it is for him who has heard a Cicero, when contemplating that future state, exclaim, as if in anxious doubt, ‘ If I err, it is a pleasing error,’—it is for such a one to appreciate the assertion that ‘ life and immortality have been brought to light through the Gospel.’ All can admire the mild and peaceable spirit inculcated by Christianity ; but it is for him who has seen inscribed on the schools of ancient philosophy, and has heard from the lips of its greatest masters, that ‘ revenge for an injury is as great a virtue as gratitude for a favor,’—it is for him to feel, with full force, that the religion which teaches us to love our enemies is not the cunningly devised scheme of a carpenter’s son, nor the invention of ignorant fishermen, but that, like its Author, it emanated from the bosom of God.

Supposing then the objection to the moral tendency of classical learning to be removed, we come to what at present more immediately concerns us,—the consideration of the propriety of substituting for it other studies, which, as is alleged, are more interesting in their character, and of greater practical utility.

That this study is in itself uninteresting, we cannot admit ; that the modes of pursuing it may be so, we cannot deny. But when it is entered upon with due preparation, and prosecuted with proper guides, it is a path strewed with flowers, and which becomes more and more pleasing at each succeeding step ; and if occasionally obstacles present themselves to the student, they do but afford him a faint representation of the course of his subsequent life, for which he will be ill qualified if he has not previously undergone that mental discipline by which he is taught to grapple with difficulties, and even to delight in the encounter.

But it is urged again that this is not a study of practical utility.—The answer to this objection will depend upon the meaning attached to that expression. If by ‘ studies of practical utility’ be meant those only which have an immediate bearing upon a man’s business in life, we ask, What branches of liberal learning can be considered as answering that description ? Why should the mass of the community be acquainted with the history of other days, or the manners and customs of other nations ? What need have they of mathematics beyond the elementary rules of arithmetic ? Why should they explore the external

world to discover its constitution and laws, or turn their observation inward, upon the more mysterious operations of their own minds?—What matters it to them to know whether the canopy above is filled with immense suns, the sources of light and heat to other systems, or is merely lighted up by innumerable tapers? Whether the meteors which occasionally flash through our atmosphere with a momentary splendor, are the fragments of some shattered planet, or the ‘snuffings of the candles of heaven?’ The starry host will perform their accustomed round, the fruitful showers will continue to descend, and the earth to bring forth her increase, the generations of men will come and go,—all the operations of nature will take place with their wonted regularity, alike whether man be informed or uninformed of their laws. It is true that such knowledge may render them much more subservient to our purposes; but if this be the only object, it needs but a few to accomplish it. The engineer can lay out our rail-roads and canals; the mechanic can invent and construct our machines; the astronomer can calculate our almanacs and nautical tables; the chemist can explore the elements of nature, and combine them for the use of the artist. So that, for all the purposes of practical utility, in this low and contracted view of it, learning need never have emerged from the retirement of the study. But if by ‘studies of practical utility’ be meant those which tend to make happier men and better citizens, which add to private enjoyment, to personal influence and respectability, then we say let all the treasures of literature and science be brought within the reach of all; let history and geography be studied, to enlarge and liberalize their views; mathematics, to teach the art of demonstrative reasoning; the physical sciences to develop the philosophy of experiment and induction; the ancient languages, to cultivate the taste, to exercise the judgment, to strengthen the memory, and to furnish an unfailing source of elegant and rational enjoyment. They all, as before remarked, have their appropriate offices and advantages. The very fact that some of them are better adapted to particular individuals than others, sufficiently proves that they call into exercise different faculties, and that therefore the course of instruction which does not combine them all, cannot impart a complete education.

Nor should the number and variety of these studies be made an objection to their all receiving a share of attention. The cultivation of one does not interfere with that of another. I appeal to the experience of every teacher, whether the diminution of the number of a pupil’s studies, provided they have been adapted to his years and capacity, promotes, in any degree, his proficiency in the remainder; or whether it be not true, that a diminution of exercise is often followed by a diminution of strength. The best linguist in a class may not always be the best mathematician; but he is not the worse mathematician for being a good linguist: on the contrary, the union of the two studies is much more likely to promote success in each. For as the strengthening of any one member of the body imparts a vigor to the whole system, so the exercise of the mind upon one subject does but qualify it for more efficient application to another.

As the knowledge of any one branch is not increased, so neither is the time of acquiring it diminished by the omission of other branches. It does not follow, because a certain number of studies can be compre-

hended in a given number of years, that, therefore, any one of them will take a proportionally less time. During the period that is devoted to education, the youthful mind is in a course of gradual development, to which the different studies, and the different stages of each study, must be accommodated; and until the faculties have attained a corresponding growth, it is as incompetent to grasp the higher portions of any one study, as of all. The truth of this remark may be illustrated by the analogy of nature, in her operations in the material world. A productive soil may, at the same time, bring forth a variety of fruits; but by no diminution of the number, and by no improvement in the system of culture, can any one of them be ripened to its just maturity, until the appropriate season has rolled around.

If then it be true, that a close attention to all the branches of a liberal education is the best means of securing high attainments in each, or at any rate, what is more important, of promoting the vigor and energy of the mind, why should any of them be neglected by those who have an opportunity to prosecute them? Surely not to indulge the indolence of the student, nor to gratify the whims of mere theorists in education.

But it may be objected by some shrewd calculators, that, if the youth be not destined for professional life, such a full course of study, or, indeed, the thorough prosecution of any portion of it, will prolong the period of pupilage beyond the time at which he would be fitted for business. It cannot be denied that in the present prosperous state of our country, most young men could obtain a support prior to the age usually allotted to the termination of a college course. But let it be recollected that the race is not to him that starts first, but to him that comes to it invigorated and disciplined by previous training;—that though the well educated youth may be delayed in his entry into business, yet he will eventually commence it with a larger and more available capital.

But did there exist any such pecuniary disadvantages in this delay as are represented, still the moral benefit would more than counterbalance them. When a young man is sent into the world with just enough of learning to make him flippant and conceited, with judgment immature, and principles unformed, it cannot be expected that he should be prepared to resist those temptations with which places of business are always beset. It is this, accordingly, which has filled the gaming table, and thronged the theatre,—which has brought disgrace upon many a son, and anguish upon many a family. When a ship is launched upon the deep, the prudent mariner is careful to provide whatever may contribute to her safety; but our youth are sent forth upon the voyage of life, with swelling sails, it may be, but often without ballast, or compass, or helm, amid rocks and whirlpools more dangerous than Scylla and Charybdis, to encounter storms more terrible than ever opposed the wanderer of Ithaca. What wonder, then, that so many of them meet with shipwreck and death.

But it is useless to attack all the Protean forms which the objections to a liberal education have assumed. We conceive that they have all been answered, if the position has been established, that the grand business of intellectual education is to train the faculties of the mind, and that this training is best effected by a union of all the branches

of literature and science, which are adapted to the comprehension of youth.

If this view of the subject be correct, then female education has been sadly misunderstood. What though, in woman, the brightest endowments of genius, and the greatest acquisitions of learning must, for the most part, shine unseen ; yet, does the companion and partner of man, the mother and nurse of the future hopes of the state, the Church, and the world, need no expansion and discipline of mind ? Away then with the mean and contracted notion, that the merest rudiments of education will answer for a female ; that she needs no geography but that of her own house, no arithmetic but that of domestic expenses, no art but the culinary, no science but that of economy. The sentiment that female ignorance is the mother of domestic bliss, originated with that kindred sentiment, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, and should with it have long ago been consigned to its primitive darkness. Let it no longer be countenanced in this enlightened age, but let us afford to woman an education that shall enable her to claim with justice, and to maintain with dignity, that station in society, which is now too often held by the slender tenure of courtesy.

If the view which we have taken of education be correct, then let parents not select for their children an occupation in life, perhaps before they can lisp its name, and educate them with exclusive reference to this. Until their faculties are developed, it cannot be known for what station they may be qualified. He whose genius you would cramp by some inferior employment, may be destined to enlighten the world.—Give him, then, the best education within your power ; and though he should fulfil no such high expectations—though upon the termination of his course of instruction, he should close his books of science and literature for ever—nay, though it were possible that every vestige of positive information which he had derived from them, could be obliterated from his memory, still his time and his labor will not have been spent for nought. Where are the products of your own childish sports and boyish exercises ? They have vanished with the hour that gave them birth ; but the graceful form, the manly vigor, and the robust health, which they imparted, still remain as substantial proofs of their utility.

If the view which we have taken of education be correct, then, young gentlemen, neither is it for you, at this early period, to be forming projects for your subsequent career, and in consequence to neglect whatever, in your opinion, will not further them ; for be assured, that as you know not what may be your future course, so, whatever it may be, no portion of knowledge which you may acquire will ever be found useless. Nor must you suppose that such an education can be obtained by a bare attendance within the walls of a seminary, however judicious may be the course of instruction, or however competent the preceptors. It has been well said by an eminent writer, that ‘there is nothing more absurd than the common notion of instruction, as if science were to be poured into the mind like water into a cistern, that passively waits to receive all that comes. The growth of knowledge rather resembles that of fruit ; however external causes may in some degree co-operate, it is the internal vigor and virtue of the tree that must ripen the juices to their just maturity.’ Your parents, therefore,

may afford you every facility with the most lavish kindness; your teachers may labor in your instruction with the most unwearied assiduity, but all will be of little avail, unless there be superadded the hearty co-operation of your own vigorous exertions. In this sense you must all be self-educated. Go on, then, as I am happy to know that many of you have already begun, go on, and imitate the example of the diminutive but instructive model of industry; the bitterest herb, as well as the most fragrant flower, will alike yield honey to your toil.—Go on, and in the mock combats of the gymnasium, prepare yourselves for the din, the dust, the keen encounter of that war of real life, in which the excellence of the weapons, and the skill of the combatants, must decide the victory.

AN ADDRESS

*Delivered to the Peithologian Society of the Wesleyan University,
August 25, 1835, by the Hon. E. JACKSON, Jun'r.*

Wesleyan University, August 27, 1835.

To the Hon. E. Jackson, Jun'r.,

SIR,—As a committee of the Peithologian Society, and as individuals, permit us to tender you our most hearty thanks for the oration delivered by you on the 25th instant, before the society to which we are attached.

By a unanimous vote we are ordered to request a copy of that address for publication, which we trust you will grant, as we know that an intelligent public cannot but be incited by its able advocacy of polite literature and practical education, to extend more zealous support to all institutions which have these as a part of their object. And we would urge the publication of it from the farther motive, that we feel that its tendency will be to counteract that degrading doctrine, so rife in the world, teaching that all learning is a burden and extravagance, which does not bring with it an immediate or prospective increase of wealth.

We take pleasure in informing you, sir, that Dr. Bangs, the editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, requests that the address make its appearance in the next number of that periodical.

With sentiments of the highest respect, we are, sir, your most obedient servants,

JOHN W. BURRUSS,
T. BANGS THORP,
MOSES L. SCUDDER, } Committee.

(Mr. Jackson's Reply.)

August 28, 1835.

GENTLEMEN,—Though the address of which you request a copy is very unworthy of publication, it is at your service to dispose of as you may think proper. Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

E. JACKSON, Jun'r.

To Messrs. John W. Burruss,
T. Bangs Thorp,
Moses L. Scudder, } Committee.

ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN OF THE PEITHOLOGIAN SOCIETY,—In undertaking the task to which your flattering invitation has called me, I have been influenced by no vain expectation of fulfilling it to your satisfaction, or my own. Profoundly sensible of the difficulty of preparing a discourse equal to such an occasion, or of worthily treating the great interests of literature and science, my object in acceding to your wishes has been solely to testify a respect for your institution, and a desire to evade the performance of no duty devolving upon me as a member of your society.

With unfeigned pleasure I congratulate you at this your first public celebration upon the success that has thus far attended your persevering exertions to establish a society, which, having in view the laudable design of mutual improvement, deserves the encouragement and good wishes of every friend of education. In spite of unusual and disheartening obstacles, you have from a small band grown to respectability in numbers, have accumulated a valuable library, the fruit of individual liberality, and have laid the foundations of an association, which, if maintained with equal zeal by those who shall come after you, will secure to your names a lasting and grateful remembrance.

Such societies have existed so long in most of our American colleges, as to have fully tested their utility, and not unfrequently have been deemed worthy to enlist the ablest pens and most eloquent tongues, to do honor to their anniversary commemorations. Their aim being more immediately directed to improvement in the arts of composition and elocution, whether they be viewed as an innocent relaxation from the more dry pursuits of science, or as a stimulating excitement of the varied faculties of the mind, they cannot but be deemed important auxiliaries in the plan of education. It is not clear, indeed, that this field for exercising and invigorating the intellectual powers, and training youth in mimic combats for the busy strife which awaits them beyond the academic walls, has ever yet been improved to the extent of which it is susceptible. Though the scheme of collegiate instruction has been greatly enlarged and advanced in our country, the order and classification of study improved, and the diligence of the student rewarded with far more ample stores of learning than our colleges could formerly bestow, it may not be an unprofitable inquiry for those upon whom devolve the honorable responsibilities of instruction, whether the value of societies like yours has received a corresponding attention.

Among their obvious advantages may be enumerated the active exercise of the invention, memory, and imagination. By this intellectual collision the mind is expanded, the recollection of scientific and historical facts refreshed, and new illustrations and perceptions are awakened. Errors are corrected, definite ideas of things fixed, self-complacency checked, and intellectual torpor prevented. A generous emulation quickens the attention, bending it to close investigation and methodical arrangement; without which the mind cannot arrive at conclusions satisfactory to itself, or convincing to others. Precision

of language, fluency of expression, and graceful elocution imperceptibly follow, until at length the deep fountains of eloquence are unsealed, and powers are revealed to the surprised and delighted youth of which he was before unconscious.

A lofty ambition, such as burns in the bosom of a gifted few, may not need the incentives of emulation to arouse its ardor in quest of knowledge ; but the mass of mankind require competition, and hence every system of education which has ever been devised, professes to found itself upon this honorable principle. The effect of well regulated debating societies, is to call into action upon a wider scale whatever has been gained by solitary application, and to excite efforts far beyond those which are prompted by the desire of excellence in the daily round of study. In the latter case, that desire is limited to the just comprehension of portions of science, but in the field of debate every science may be made to contribute its aid, and to furnish weapons whose combined and dexterous use tasks the utmost energies of the mind.

The estimation in which such exercises are held will vary with the different views which each one may entertain on the subject of education. He who contemns the charms of felicitous style, or the graces of oratory, though he may not appreciate their importance in these departments, yet nevertheless will not withhold his approbation of their influence in forming and strengthening the reasoning powers. Such diversities of opinion upon the proper objects and direction of education necessarily arise from the different temperaments and habits of men ; and in this age of free discussion have given birth to an endless variety of systems for the instruction of youth. The comparative advantages of public and private tuition, the value of ancient classical learning, the establishment of a uniform and equal standard of education,—these, with many other topics of a similar nature, have been agitated in every portion of the civilized world, with a zeal correspondent to their interest and importance.

In our own country, the structure of civil society differing essentially from all historical experience, and presenting new moral and intellectual aspects for philosophical examination, these inquiries respecting the system of education best adapted to a rational and self-governed people, have been pushed farther, and I had almost said more extravagantly, than in any other part of the world. The novelty of our social condition giving plausibility to speculations which cannot always be contradicted by analogy, or confuted by experience, has opened a wide field to visionaries and enthusiasts for the display of their favorite theories, and it is not less remarkable than creditable to the good sense of the people, that thus far these innovators have not been able to make any serious inroad upon the reverend usages and discipline of our universities.

Nevertheless the predominant spirit of the times is improvement.—Already its advances have changed the character of the whole civilized world by such rapid triumphs of art, that nothing less than the most extraordinary discoveries and inventions can arrest the public attention. Every element has been vexed by this active and insatiable principle, its hidden virtues explored, and in innumerable forms made tributary to the service of man. Nor has this eager curiosity been confined to the material world. The human mind has been profoundly analyzed,

its various faculties discriminated and defined, and its operations assisted by the most lucid order and arrangement. The first effect of these close and liberal investigations has been to establish a sound and just philosophy in contradistinction to the arbitrary dogmas which had for ages been received upon the authority of distinguished names ; the next effect has been a general amelioration of the social state throughout the world. No sooner had the mind been permitted to discover the true relations of things, than men became impatient of every unjust restraint of their natural or civil rights, and after many and painful struggles, have in some countries wholly, and in others partially reclaimed their original inheritance. In the more favored portions of the human family, the principles of civil liberty, guaranteed by law, have become so completely incorporated with every notion of government, that no change or revolution can ever wholly eradicate them. Instead therefore of that restless anxiety which characterizes nations seeking to acquire their primary rights, a people secure of their possession are intent only upon turning them to the utmost possible advantage for themselves, and for mankind. Hence in our own happy country, no plan of moral or intellectual improvement, no scheme of benevolence or philanthropy, no experiment to mitigate the ills of life or advance the interests of society, is viewed with indifference. The foundation of free schools and other institutions for education, the organization of societies for the diffusion of the Gospel, the establishment of foreign missions, and last though not least, the vast and noble design of African colonization, all bear honorable testimony to the active influence of free institutions. The surprising changes wrought by the light of science in the condition of society are illustrated by nothing more strikingly, than by the increased facilities of intercourse, which not only strengthen every where the bonds of human sympathy, but create a chain along which the spark of knowledge is conducted with electric rapidity. Those are now living who may remember when the literary communication between nations was confined to a few learned men, who contrived with difficulty to maintain with each other an uncertain and irregular correspondence ; but now every novelty in science, every production of genius, from whatsoever quarter of the globe, is speeded over pathless oceans by the unrivalled skill of modern navigation in an incredibly short space of time, or borne with still greater celerity into the heart of every country by the swift-winged power of steam.

Amid these various and active improvements the subject of education could not fail deeply to engage and divide the public mind. Much that was deemed venerable by our fathers has been exploded by common consent, as inapplicable to our altered condition, and the question still remains undecided, whether yet more shall not be sacrificed upon the altar of reform. Upon the just determination of this question the welfare of future generations greatly depends, for it may not be denied that education exerts a decisive influence upon national as well as individual character, and that we cannot be too cautious in fixing the standard which may affect the destinies of our beloved country to the remotest time.

While a few still cherish an exclusive veneration for the ancient schools, others are willing to concede much to the vast acquisitions of

experimental science in modern times, while a third party with equal zeal reject whatever is not stamped with an obvious, and as it were tangible utility. As usual, the truth probably lies in the middle course, which, embracing a due portion of the practical science of the age, combines also sufficient of polite learning to save us from degenerating into mere utilitarians.

That a lively concern for the cause of education, and a wise discretion in the choice of means, are not only important, but absolutely essential to the permanence of free institutions of government, is obvious to the slightest reflection; since the only sure tenure of popular rights is their thorough comprehension. Nations subject to despotic rule have but a brief lesson to learn, that of passive obedience; but where the governed are also the governors, no one can become too familiar with the various and complicated interest of political and social economy. The apparent simplicity of our own institutions betrays when closely examined the most consummate art, and whoever presumptuously imagines that such a scheme of civil government as binds together this vast confederacy may be easily devised or successfully imitated,

'Sudet multum, frustra que laboret

Ausus idem.'——

Who shall assert then that any degree of moral or intellectual culture is superfluous to a people daily called, under the auspices of such a constitution, to the exercise of the highest political privileges, and the decision of the gravest questions of human polity?

Yet there are those, I regret to say even among our own countrymen, who refuse to admit the importance of the higher grades of literary institutions, and regard them with a jealous and unfriendly eye, as the nurseries of principles dangerous to freedom, as well as the seats of an unprofitable learning. A prejudice of this kind must be the offspring of ignorance, rashness, or depraved moral taste. Rarely indeed has it the sanction of those to whose opinions experience gives authority, who having themselves drank deeply at the wells of science are best capable of judging of its effects. When we consider that every new acquisition of knowledge brings man one step nearer to the Supreme Intelligence, can it be worthy of a civilized age to wage war like the fanatic Saracen upon the asylums of learning, to bring the human mind down to a dead level, to crush the aspirations of genius, or circumscribe the pure light of science?

It is a vulgar error which confounds the character of cloistered learning with the liberal spirit of modern institutions. Science in those days was the handmaid of oppression, forging chains for the mind when the body was already enslaved. Education was literally a craft, in which the truths of nature and the discoveries of art were blended with a vain and frivolous philosophy, deeply tinged with superstition, and basely dedicated to the service of arbitrary power. The darkness of popular ignorance favored every species of imposture, and gave to its false lights a meteor brilliancy which dazzled and led astray even the strongest minds. The sublime sciences were prostituted to the juggles of astrology and divination; the study of physics was made subservient to the idle pursuit of alchemy; reason moved mechanically, according to the rules of arbitrary logic, and theology was distorted by fables as monstrous as those of heathen mythology. From this delu-

sive and pernicious system the world was at length awakened, by the simplest yet greatest of human inventions, and lifted upon the mighty wings of the press, science soared aloft free and unfettered over the whole civilized world. The unworthy tenants of academic shades were displaced by the ministers of truth, and with the mummeries of religious bigotry for ever fled the sophistries of pedantry, the ostentation of learning, and the creeds of political slavery.

It is likewise a very common and pardonable error of self-taught and strong-minded men, who have hewn out, as it were, their own education without the aid of scholastic discipline, to indulge an overweening contempt for that portion of polite learning which to the classical student is an object of fond veneration. Such persons, referring every thing to the test of its direct applicability to the business pursuits of life, cannot easily be made to comprehend how the study of a dead language, or the perusal of ancient classics, can at all compare in importance with a knowledge of the principles of the steam engine, or the mysteries of trade. They make no allowances because they do not always realize the fine moral influence which these studies exert upon the character, and which have procured for them in some of the schools the honorable and exclusive title of humanities. As intimately connected with individual and social prosperity, the practical sciences are of the first importance, but if man be designed for something more than to make provision for his immediate necessities, or the gratification of his senses, then whatever tends to refine the taste, purify the heart, and exalt the imagination, deserves also a prominent place in the scheme of education. A people whose knowledge should be confined to demonstration, or to mere facts, would be in danger of becoming not only skeptics in religion, but dull and unenterprising in character. The mind requires variety of food for its healthy action, and if we could destroy the records and the writings of antiquity, we should discover, when too late, that we had lost one of the greatest spurs to human intellect, as well as one of the chief sources of its decoration.

Whether it be the necessary result of a general system, or a proof of the peculiar influence of classical literature, it is nevertheless true, that of the multitude of names distinguished in modern history, for that wisdom and eloquence that sway and guide the affairs of nations, or survive in imperishable records to posterity, the far greater number have been deeply imbued with a knowledge of the ancient classics.—Scarce a single exception can be found among the best European writers whose style does not bear the plainest evidence of the models of antiquity, upon which they were formed. Nor does this justify the charge of a tame and servile imitation, any more than the close study of the remains of the great masters of painting or sculpture argues the absence or the restraint of original genius. Whether we imitate the excellencies of others, or aim at originality, still nature is the great prototype, and our success must always be in proportion to the closeness of our adherence to her unerring standard.

The task of public instruction is so responsible and laborious, so replete with sacrifices and privations; its aims are so noble and philanthropic, and the character of its ministers for the most part so exemplary, that we might well wonder how they should become objects of jealousy

or hostility, could we forget that this is the common fate of the benefactors of mankind. If Socrates could not escape the charge of corrupting the youth of Athens, nor the acknowledged truth of Aristides save him from banishment, it were vain for those who imitate their example to indulge too great a confidence in a better fortune. The infidel regards them with dislike as one of the bulwarks of Christianity : to the loose and unprincipled there is a daily beauty in moral restraints and steady discipline which makes their own lives hideous. The idle and ignorant always look with envy upon superior illumination, while many without a motive, and without reflection, hastily condemn that which they have taken no pains to understand. But while the education of American youth continues to be directed by men of such blameless lives and active benevolence as those who have ever graced our seats of learning, there is every reason to believe that they will experience a protecting and fostering care at the hands of a just and intelligent people.

If we proposed to illustrate the value of such a course of liberal studies as our universities alone afford by reference to any particular science, no one perhaps would exemplify it more forcibly, than that which of all others stands first in our estimation, because it is the source and the safeguard of our dearest rights,—I mean the science of law. Notwithstanding the simplicity of our theory of government, its practical operation is complicated by social and political relations even more diversified than those which spring from monarchical institutions. The commercial and international code which regulates our trade and foreign intercourse is co-extensive with that of other states, while our domestic legislation superadds the necessity of a perpetual vigilance to conform it to the constitutional standard. The peculiar importance therefore, to us, of a science whose ‘seat,’ it has been finely said, ‘is the bosom of God, and its voice the harmony of the world,’ is universally confessed ; and we may the more readily, alas ! appreciate its value at this time, when the recent death of one of its brightest ornaments is deplored, not merely as the loss of a wise and virtuous citizen, but in connection with his official station, as a great national calamity. A certain forensic dexterity, and practical familiarity with existing laws may be acquired by sagacious and vigorous minds without the aid of liberal education ; but no jurist has ever left a durable name in the annals of his own or of other countries, whose labors have not had their foundation in a previous course of academical learning.

‘Sciences,’ says a great authority, ‘are of a sociable disposition, and flourish but in the neighborhood of each other ; nor is there any branch of learning but may be helped and improved by assistances drawn from other arts. If therefore the student in our laws hath formed both his sentiments and style by perusal and imitation of the purest classical writers, among whom the historians and orators will best deserve his regard ; if he can reason with precision, and separate argument from fallacy by the clear simple rules of pure unsophisticated logic ; if he can fix his attention and steadily pursue truth through any the most intricate deductions, by the use of mathematical demonstrations ; if he has enlarged his conceptions of nature and art by view of the several branches of genuine experimental philosophy ; if he has impressed on his mind the sound maxims of the law of nature, the best and most

authentic foundation of human laws; if lastly he has contemplated those maxims reduced to a practical system in the laws of imperial Rome;—if he has done this, or any part of it, a student thus qualified may enter upon the study of the law with incredible advantage and reputation.'

Such has been the testimony of the wise and learned in favor of academical instruction in the arts and sciences necessary to the successful pursuit of either of the liberal professions. It is in these schools that the most eminent expounders and vindicators of our constitution and laws have already been trained, and from this source, whatever sciolists may assert to the contrary, will continue to be drawn through all time the ablest champions of our political rights. It is no argument against this position, that so few among the numbers who receive collegiate honors, attain to great distinction, for though all cannot be conspicuous, all may be useful in their day and generation, and diffuse even in a limited sphere the influence of sound and enlightened principles. Where public opinion regulates the acts of a government, it is of the last importance that that opinion should be correct, and it is no disparagement of the acknowledged intelligence of the American people to suppose that questions will frequently require their decision, demanding more time, experience, and study, than can be conveniently spared from private engagements. It is upon such occasions that education makes itself felt, and no society is so small as not to contain some at least, whose disciplined habits of thought greatly assist the just and speedy formation of public sentiment. In this class of individuals the great proportion will be found to consist of those who have enjoyed the advantages of academic instruction, and furnishes strong testimony of the practical benefits which it confers upon society.

So far also from being dangerous in their political tendency, the learned institutions of modern times are the favorite haunts of liberty, where the sacred fires will longest burn, because they are fed by the hands of virtue and religion. Every appeal wrung from suffering humanity, every cry of freedom that breaks the stillness of European despotism, is echoed back from the bosom of her universities. But though the flame of liberty glows no where more brightly than in the breast of the solitary student, it is not among the votaries of learning that are found those factious demagogues and turbulent politicians who disturb the peace and endanger the safety of nations. Absorbed in more tranquil and innocent pursuits, they have little thirst for popular applause, or leisure to brood over schemes of ambition. If they turn their thoughts sometimes to public affairs it is with minds enlarged, elevated, and warmed by the recollection of those bright memorials of ancient virtue which their studies have made familiar. To meditate aught against the true interests of their compatriots would be in them a double crime, involving treason against their country, with a sacrilegious contempt for the inspirations of classic story. The divine lessons of Homer, the glowing patriotism of Demosthenes, the stern virtue of Tacitus, and the indignant muse of Juvenal, restrain with salutary awe the heart that has once acknowledged their power. Who that has ever enjoyed the story of Ulysses tried by every vicissitude of fortune, yet ever sustained by reliance upon Heaven, has not been taught an exalted lesson of piety. Who can contemplate the portraits

drawn by the masterly hand of Plutarch without being enamoured of truth, and inspired with love of country? Seldom can we rise unmoved from the spectacle of human wo, or the triumphs of human virtue, however plainly depicted; but how much more vivid and durable is the impression, when genius invests the tale with its most captivating graces, or transmits it in harmonious numbers to the latest posterity!

An objection to the mode of education we have been considering has had its origin in a real or affected doubt of the practicability or expediency of attaining a high literary character in a republic constituted like ours. The argument of its inexpediency is calculated to provoke a smile, when contrasted with the morbid impatience invariably excited in us by reflections upon our national literature. The most cynical railer at classical learning at home indignantly repels the assaults of foreigners upon the merits of our writers, and holds it to be a duty to assert for his country the loftiest pretensions in arts as well as arms. While such an honorable pride inflames the bosoms of Americans, a pride of country which abroad merges domestic discontents, and even party feuds, in the broad sentiment of patriotism, there is little room to apprehend the want of incentives to fame, or indifference to the cause of letters.

This alleged incompatibility of our civil institutions with excellence in the liberal arts and sciences, is deduced among other reasons from the absence of the patronage of privileged orders, or of the support of royal munificence. But if these causes have sometimes contributed to the encouragement of learning, they have as frequently hastened its decline, by substituting for the vigorous fruits of unfettered intellect the sickly growth of flattery and courtly dependence. History teaches us that the love of *fame* has been in all ages the most powerful incentive to literary renown, and that however the beams of patronage and power may warm into life the fine arts, of which wealth is the indispensable aliment, yet the human mind displays its masculine energies no where so conspicuously as in republican communities. Simplicity, the attribute of greatness, does not belong to a highly polished and artificial condition of society, but on the contrary, the most majestic efforts of genius have illustrated ages of comparative rudeness. The master poet of antiquity recited his verses for a precarious subsistence to a people little removed from barbarism, and the sublimest bard of modern times flourished under the auspices of a Puritan republic.—The influence of hereditary institutions may multiply the number of the highly educated, but how few of that favored class profit from their superior advantages, beyond the increase of their own susceptibilities to the refinements of taste, or ever turn their attainments to the honor and improvement of society. Even that nation from whom we are proud to derive our origin, owes to the republican features of its constitution the *most* brilliant names which adorn its annals, men who sprang from the humbler walks of life, graced with no titles but those of genius and virtue, and unaided but by the strong impulse of necessity and ambition. From such examples we may learn that intellectual power does not depend upon any particular forms of civil society so much as upon the freedom of its operations, and that like the mountain pine it can strike its roots deeply in the roughest soil, and thrive in the most inhospitable atmosphere.

The rise and progress of philosophy, understood in its largest sense, has been slow and laborious wherever it has flourished. The infancy of nations is sufficiently occupied with the first wants of nature, in providing for security, and in the establishment of order and good government. With the attainment of these ends comes that leisure for the prosecution of studies which is not to be found amid the din of arms and the busy pursuits of commerce. There is therefore nothing discouraging in the fact that a people scarce fifty years old, still actively engaged in laying the foundations of a mighty empire, should have added little to the stock of human learning, in comparison with more ancient nations. The wonder is, that they should have done so much, and presages what they may do when the enterprise of its citizens shall seek new channels of distinction and compete with the old world in literature, as they have already successfully done in practical science. We need not be ashamed to acknowledge that our chief motive to intellectual exertion has thus far been necessity, since wherever the path of knowledge has held out the prospect of reward, we have been enabled to demonstrate that it is not impossible to keep pace with our trans-Atlantic brethren. The same genius which has enabled commerce to overcome the current of the mightiest rivers, and to explore the most remote and perilous navigation, which is rapidly uniting the widely distant parts of this continent by roads and canals, surpassing in many respects those of ancient Rome,—which, in a word, has raised us from the condition of feeble colonies to the first rank of civilized nations, will prove in due time equally capable of disputing with others the palm of excellence in every department of literature.

Nor are there wanting to Americans objects of as lofty pride and generous ambition as ever fired the breasts of any people of ancient or modern days. Placed on a new and vast theatre, where, for the first time since the creation of the world, man enjoys every right which reason and nature approve, elevated by the recollections of a history, glorious, though brief, and conscious of the immense importance to the whole human race of the social experiment in which they are engaged; have any motives more dignified, have any impulses more exciting co-operated on human ambition?

We cannot indeed point to long lines of noble ancestry—our pride is not soothed by the display of heraldic honors—no magnificent remains of art attest our ancient power and wealth, and it is but within a few years that even our name has been recorded as a nation in the pages of history. But into those years what events have been crowded!—Handfuls of men, the germ of future states, present themselves first to the view, at wide intervals along our extensive coast; their settlements scarce visible upon the margin of primeval forests. From these points we behold them spreading in small but resolute bands over unexplored regions, looking to Heaven and their own brave hearts for defence against wild and hostile tribes. Through what scenes of suffering, of violence, and blood were they doomed to pass, before establishing their infant communities in security and peace! Scarcely had this been accomplished, when new and more portentous dangers threatened to frustrate all their labors, and deprive them of their dear-bought freedom. For seven years a powerful and haughty foe, who had carried her conquests to the ends of the earth, poured upon this

devoted nation an unceasing storm of war. Amid plundered commerce and conflagrated towns, amid the destruction of youth and age by the edge of the sword, or the toils and diseases of the camp, no thought of submission, no propitiation of the wrath of an offended monarch, could be extorted from this high-minded people. While we are enjoying the peaceful fruits of that memorable struggle, it is wise sometimes to look back upon its scenes, that we may neither forget the debt of gratitude we owe, nor the value of privileges purchased at so dear a price.

Every part of our common country furnishes a page of local history full of adventurous enterprise and extraordinary changes. Two centuries ago, the valley through which flows the noble river on which we reside, was one unbroken wilderness. At this day probably a million of inhabitants dwell there in peace and prosperity, strangers to suffering and want, and experiencing every advantage which equal and beneficent laws and widely diffused education can confer upon man.— Contrast this picture with that of any other nation of ancient or modern times, with the system of conquest and colonization of the Greeks and Romans, or the gigantic schemes of the first civilized monarch of Russia, and which of them presents the more noble and animating picture of national glory, or reflects the highest credit upon the race of man! What American would exchange the sentiments of honest pride with which he surveys the peaceful triumphs of civilization in his native land, for all the blood-stained trophies of the Roman legions, or the thousand victories of France or England? That which enhances the value of these considerations is the fact that this pacific progress is not the offspring of a timid or unwarlike character, but the necessary result of a scheme of government founded in reason and true philanthropy. The tendency of our institutions leads us to estimate nations not by the terror of their arms, or the extent of their possessions, so much as by the number of benefactors they have contributed to the human family. Take from the pages of history the names of those who have taught mankind how to live and how to die, and what remains but a dark disgusting picture of human vices. Amid the weary waste of ambition and of crime, these appear like the verdant spots and gushing fountains of the desert. When the artificial distinctions of society are forgotten, when national antipathies sleep with the promiscuous multitude in the grave, the examples of such men become the common property of mankind, and survive in a wider sphere of usefulness and fame.

But while we contemplate with pride the rising glories of our destined career, let us not forget the warnings of experience, nor that it has been the lot of nations invariably to decline after reaching the meridian of prosperity. How far our institutions may contain that conservative principle which has hitherto been sought in vain, and how long they may ward off the dangers of revolution and dissension, Omniscience can alone perceive; but this at least we know, that if we cannot escape the common doom of nations, our fall can only be protracted by *the cultivation of virtue and the dissemination of knowledge*. The spirit of civil convulsion is always fierce, savage, and destructive in proportion to the ignorance of the people. The unchastened instincts and undisciplined passions of men are easily roused and excited to break through the restraints of law; but an educated people are slow

to embark in revolutions—they weigh the grounds of discontent, estimate coolly the prospect of relief, and ultimately rally to the side of reason and justice. However weak and credulous minds may be moved by artful misrepresentations to repine at imaginary discontents, the great body of the American people, so long as they continue to be an educated people, must see and feel what no other nation has ever before realized, that no change can improve their condition, and that therefore every one is concerned to maintain the cause of law and order.

These exhortations to speed the march of reason and improvement address themselves with peculiar force to such of our youth as enjoy the privileges of collegiate instruction. Upon the soundness of *their* views, and *their* fidelity to the cause of learning the literary reputation of our country almost wholly depends. If they imbibe just notions of moral and intellectual philosophy; if they carry into society a taste for the elegancies of literature and the arts; if they inculcate by example a zealous esteem for the institutions of learning, their combined influence will operate with powerful and salutary energy upon the public mind. Before such a concentrated light the mists of ignorance and the delusions of prejudice will melt away, and our country will find in her ingenious and accomplished sons more safety than did Thebes from the armed hosts that issued from her hundred gates.

To realize these auspicious results is no slight achievement; to qualify himself to guide and direct the taste of others, the student must by patient labor first purify his own. The course of study in our universities, if diligently prosecuted, is sufficient to give to the judgment sound direction through life. But whatever aids experience may supply to smooth and facilitate the rugged paths of study, they avail little, unless seconded by the closest application, and the most persevering attention. The imagination, spreading its flight over the intermediate gradations of labor and diligence, is too prone to revel in the anticipation of that goal which can only be reached by slow and arduous steps. This impatience so natural to youth is often augmented by that stern necessity which prematurely forces the American student upon the theatre of active life, and requires therefore the greater vigilance to restrain it within the bounds of reason. The effects of hasty and superficial culture are the more serious, because they are irreparable, especially when accompanied with the self-complacency which cannot discover its own deficiencies. Happy, thrice happy is he who sees in the preliminary stages of education, only an introduction to the highest enjoyments which this world affords, who rejoices each day in the acquisition as it were of new senses, and new capacities; who feels his moral and intellectual power dilate, his dignity and value in the scale of created beings augment, and can reflect with proud satisfaction that these are the trophies of his own exertions.

To you, gentlemen, and to your fellow students the path of science is opened under circumstances which are equally a subject of felicitation to this community, as to yourselves. Filling the place of an ephemeral institution which exemplified one of those popular, but delusive innovations upon the established system of education, to which allusion has been made, the Wesleyan University is destined to imitate its predecessor neither in its premature prosperity, nor its swift decline.

Without any ostentatious claims to superiority, it is silently but steadily winning its way into public confidence, fixing its foundations for future usefulness slowly, but durably, and exhibiting in its annual public examinations the fruits of excellent discipline, and a thorough system of instruction. Every department of science taught in other colleges is filled by able professors, who to the ordinary sense of responsibility superadd the ambition of giving an honorable name to their infant university. To these gentlemen it is but rendering a just tribute of praise, to remark with commendation the tone of manly sobriety which characterizes the manners of their pupils, and commands the respect and confidence of society.

The religious denomination under whose immediate auspices this institution has been founded, having ever been remarkable for energy and perseverance, not less than for their fervent piety, it is not unreasonable to expect that the same zeal which has planted the cross in the remotest confines of civilization, softened and subdued the wild and fierce manners of the farthest west, and illustrated every where, by the most shining examples, the Divine precepts of the Gospel, will not fail to distinguish itself by equal efforts in the cause of learning. Their simple habits and sound practical sense peculiarly adapt them to the purposes of republican education ; and with the support of its numerous friends, and its own meritorious titles to public patronage, the day cannot be distant when the Wesleyan University must take rank with the first institutions of our country.

These hasty reflections, gentlemen, which require so much of your indulgence, cannot be more appropriately concluded than by invoking for our now happy and beloved country the continuance of that Divine favor which has ever signally attended us ; which having saved us from foreign oppression, can alone by the inspiration of wisdom and virtue save us from self-destruction. So far as human means can influence human fortunes, ours are emphatically in our own hands. With every variety of climate, soil, and production, remote from external enemies, and enjoying the protecting smiles of Heaven, what but our own folly can prevent the fulfilment of the highest destinies for which man has ever yet been reserved ! While we cultivate in our domestic policy a spirit of justice, moderation, and wise forbearance, may no hostile foes disturb the repose of our eagle as he surveys the boundless scene of grandeur that bursts upon his view ; may he long behold the star-spangled banner waving in peace from the frozen regions of the north to the glowing climes of the south, and prepare to wing his exulting flight from the rising to the setting sun.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

Nineteenth Annual Report of the American Bible Society.

We gladly avail ourselves of the privilege of submitting to our readers a condensed view of the doings of this society, during the nineteenth year of its existence. At a time when every secret spring is set in action—every motive which prompts to individual and social effort—every argument which can be addressed to the understandings

or passions of the people, are resorted to for the purpose of keeping up an excited action in the public mind, it is no less cheering than profitable to behold the charitable institutions of our country silently 'pursuing the even tenor of their way,' shedding on all who come within the circle of their influence rays of light and heat, and conducting them onward in the paths of 'peace and pleasantness.'

Though the political horizon be overspread with portentous clouds which seem to threaten us with a destructive storm—though there are 'shakings and tremblings' in different parts of our republic, particularly in some of our large cities,—we trust the God of the Bible will overrule these things for our good, and that those dense clouds, instead of pouring down the hail-stones of destruction, will yet 'distil as the dew upon the tender herb, and as the rain upon the grass.'

Antagonist principles are indeed, as they always have been, at work. Each is emulous to obtain the preponderance. Which shall eventually prevail is known only to the God of Providence. We have reason however to believe, from numerous declarations of the spirit of prophecy, that 'righteousness shall yet cover the earth'—that idolatry shall be crumbled to the dust—that superstition shall be banished from among men—and that the 'arm of Jehovah shall be made bare in the sight of all nations,' and that

'Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Does his successive journeys run.'

Among other causes now in operation which are likely to contribute to the consummation of this grand prophetic period, the general circulation of the Holy Scriptures 'without note or comment,' is not the least. This is 'the sword of the Spirit.' And wherever the Spirit Himself is present to use His own sword, it shall do execution. The *living* ministry must be present to wield this Divine sword, with hearts filled with the 'unction of the holy One,' and then both together shall 'pull down the strong holds of Satan.' We are glad to find in the introduction of the report before us, such a distinct and marked recognition of the Divine hand as is expressed in the following words:—

"In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths." This inspired counsel, so proper for individual observance, is no less worthy of regard by those who act in an associated capacity. The conductors of the American Bible Society perform a most obvious as well as cheerful duty, when they acknowledge a Divine hand in the origin of this institution, and ascribe to the same source all the success which has attended its subsequent operations. They and their predecessors have acted under the abiding impression, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." It was the kind providence of God which brought together Christians of different religious names, and united them in this happy confederacy, and which has since preserved unbroken harmony among the managers, and among their fellow laborers throughout the land. The same overruling

Providence has raised up liberal contributors, prepared the way for the extensive circulation of the Scriptures at home, and opened for their reception many entire nations, which were wholly inaccessible to the Bible distributor when the Society was formed. In all this the managers would distinctly recognize the agency of Him who inspired the sacred volume, and designed that it should be diffused among every people and tongue. They would at this time specially acknowledge the kind providence which has been over the Society during the year now closed, and which has permitted them to meet so many of their respected brethren and fellow laborers on this anniversary occasion.'

The following is the amount of the *receipts* during the year :—

'In the course of the year there has been received into the treasury from all sources, the sum of \$100,806 26, being an increase of \$12,-205 44 over the receipts of the preceding year.

Of these receipts there have been—

In payment for Bibles and Testaments,	-	-	\$34,918 23
From legacies,	-	-	3,877 26
For distribution in foreign countries,	-	-	31,821 02
Unrestricted donations,	-	-	27,973 78

Bibles and Testaments printed.

There have been printed in the course of the year,

Bibles,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16,000
Testaments,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,000
Spanish Gospels,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000

Who has not felt for oppressed Greece? Her moanings have come up before God, and we hope it may be said in truth that 'the set time has come to visit her' in mercy. The Turkish yoke has been broken; and though her 'young men have been slain in the streets,' and her maidens exposed to the rapacious destroyer of their innocence—and though a 'foreigner rules over them,' because of the oppression of the many—yet we trust God has mercy in store for her children. Both the civil and Christian world have turned their attention to this interesting portion of our race; and who knows but the efforts which are put forth in their behalf may be crowned with success? British and American missionaries have visited their shores, and are now assiduously employed in watering their soil with the water of life; and the American Bible Society is lending its aid to scatter among them the 'bread which shall endure unto everlasting life.' The following is the account given of this laudable work :—

Modern Greek Testament.

'It was stated in the last report, that 1,305 copies of this book had been forwarded to the Rev. Messrs. King, Temple, Robertson, Brewer, and others, in Greece and vicinity. From all these gentlemen named, letters have been received, though neither of them had as yet given the work a thorough investigation. As the translation, however, is familiar to readers in the Testaments formerly distributed in that country by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and as your plates were read by competent modern Greek scholars, little doubt can

be entertained that the book will prove a blessing to many ready to perish. From a very recent letter from the Rev. Mr. Brewer, at Smyrna, the following extract will show how the work was received in that quarter :—

“ Agreeably to your intimations, I have received two boxes of Greek Testaments, which I found to contain, the one 231, the other 200 copies—in all 431. A few dozens of these remain not disposed of, only because we are uncertain when our stock or Mr. Baker’s depot will be replenished. With very few exceptions, these have been gratuitously distributed in the schools of Smyrna and its vicinity. In determining the proportions, I have acted chiefly in conjunction with the Rev. Mr. Jetter, of the British Church Missionary Society, who, as well as myself, has been especially devoted to the department of schools. Fifty copies were sent to the school in the neighboring village of Cookhijah, on the suggestion of Mr. King, and a few others have been given on the recommendation of Mr. Temple, with the offer of dividing the whole stock with him if he chose. Twenty copies have been sent to the schools in Magresia, forty to the schools of Mr. Jetter in the neighboring schools of Boujah. His and our schools in town, and six or seven others of the public schools have shared the remainder, in different proportions, from ten to seventy ; and I can assure the friends of the Bible cause that it has been most refreshing within a few days past, on attending their annual examinations, to see the rows of these red-edged volumes intermingled with the brown and black borders of Testaments and Psalters, heretofore liberally presented by the agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society.” ’

The total number of copies of the Holy Scriptures issued the last year, including the entire Bible and parts of it, is 123,236, and the aggregate number since the formation of the Society in 1816, is 1,767,736.

‘ The blind shall see.’ Among other improvements of the age—while the deaf and dumb are taught to read and write, and to converse, an experiment has been made to enable the blind to read. The report gives the following facts :—

New Testament for the Blind.

‘ A short time before your last anniversary a donation of nearly two hundred dollars was received, contributed at a public meeting in Boston, to aid in preparing the Scriptures for the blind. During the year now closed, the attention of your board has again been called to this subject by Samuel G. Howe, M. D., principal of the “ New-England Society for the Education of the Blind.” After having spent some time in England, France, and Germany, pursuing investigations connected with the humane object to which he is devoted, Dr. Howe has commenced the preparation of books with raised letters, which his pupils easily trace and comprehend by the touch. Numerous experiments have been made, and great pains taken to reduce the letter to the smallest palpable form, as only one side of a sheet can receive raised letters. Having determined as to the size and form of letters, having obtained a press suitable for this species of printing, this gentleman, on behalf of the institution with which he is connected, and of

more than six thousand blind in the United States, has applied to your board for means to publish the New Testament. After satisfactory inquiries, the managers have granted one thousand dollars towards the accomplishment of this interesting object, and have promised farther assistance during the coming year. The entire expense of this Testament will be about six dollars, and the contemplated edition of five hundred copies, three thousand dollars. To aid this publication, the Massachusetts Bible Society has contributed one thousand dollars, and the New-York Female Bible Society, with a characteristic liberality, has ventured to promise the sum of eight hundred dollars. It is ascertained, that after a season of practice, a blind pupil will read this raised letter with much facility. How great and unanticipated must be the blessing which this publication will bring to multitudes, shut out from the beauties of the material creation, and doomed to so many hours of mental solitude. In the appendix will be found a communication of Dr. Howe, which will give additional information on the topic presented above.'

It is a lamentable fact that wherever the Roman Catholic religion has obtained the predominancy, there the Holy Scriptures are denied the people in their vernacular language. Protestantism, in its renovating operations, enlightens the mind, by banishing the darkness of popery, and awakens a spirit of inquiry among all ranks and orders of the people. Though we cannot subscribe to the maxim that the '*Bible is the religion* of Protestants,' yet we know that wheresoever the Bible is *read, understood*, and its truths *felt*, by being applied to the heart through the energies of the Holy Spirit, there the religion which it prescribes as the remedy for the evils of our nature is *enjoyed*, its blessings duly *appreciated*, and all its holy fruits are seen growing and thriving to maturity. Though therefore the Bible is not religion itself, yet it describes what religion is, how and where it may be found, and what must be done to disseminate it among mankind. Let then this bright lamp shine in all its Divine lustre—let its truths be understood and felt—its holy precepts experienced and practised, and the destructive errors of popery shall disappear—civil and ecclesiastical despotism shall be prostrated—and the genuine principles of civil and religious liberty shall prevail and triumph.

Who does not therefore rejoice at every successful effort to send the Bible into Roman Catholic countries? South America, so long cursed with the blighting influence of Romanism—so long torn to pieces with civil discord, as if the just retributions of Divine Providence were now visiting this land where the detested Cortes and his sanguinary associates inflicted such summary vengeance upon the defenceless natives—South America is receiving the word of life by the instrumentality of the American Bible Society. The following extract from the report will show what is doing in this benevolent enterprise in this interesting portion of our continent:—

‘From Mr. Isaac Watts Wheelwright, the society’s agent for Spanish America, several communications have been received in the course of the year. He reached the republic of Chili in March, 1834, with about 2,000 copies of Bibles and Testaments, mostly in the Spanish tongue. In the course of seven months he visited Santiago, the capital, Valparaiso, Concepcion, Aconagua, Quillota, Coquimbo, and many other of the larger towns, carrying with him a supply of books for each place. The civil officers, the common people generally, and a part of the priesthood were highly favorable to his benevolent object. One clergyman, a member of the senate, expressed his full conviction that the Bible ought to have an unrestricted circulation. The bishop of the diocesis, however, summoning the agent before him, expressed his disapprobation of his labors, and requested him to desist from farther distributions. The consequence was, that two boxes of books which had been left with a native agent for disposal, were received back to save them from the flames. In the south part of the nation less opposition was manifested, and a good number of books disposed of, many of them for the use of schools. The total distribution in that republic amounted to about twelve hundred copies.

‘The agent next visited Lima, the capital of Peru. Here he found less of direct opposition to his work. Indeed some of the clergy and others manifested a willingness to organize a Bible Society for the purpose of circulating the Scriptures, a measure, however, which your agent did not, on the whole, think it wise to adopt. A lamentable apathy toward the Bible is found to prevail by the agent in all places which he visits, even where no opposition to him is found. Few place such a value on this blessed book as to be willing to purchase it, unless at a price greatly reduced, and many will not purchase on any terms. In the course of a two months’ residence in Peru about 400 copies have been disposed of, a part of which went to interior villages. Your board have forwarded to the agent an additional number of Bibles and Testaments, and also copies of the Gospel of Matthew. There is reason to expect that for the latter there will be found a more extensive demand. As the agent appears to your board to be judicious, economical, and persevering, as he has now the language of the country, and as the need of Bible influence is painfully obvious among the people where he labors, it seems desirable that his services should be prolonged another year, at least until a full experiment is made, whether the word of life is there to have free course or not. Your board cannot but indulge the hope that the more discerning of those countries will, ere long, see that the stability of their civil institutions, as well as the growth of true religion, is never to be realized by them, nor by any people, unless based on a knowledge of Divine truth, widely diffused and deeply revered.

‘In addition to the books sent to Mr. Wheelwright, and to the newly formed auxiliaries in Texas, 500 of the Spanish Gospels of Matthew have been sent to the Hon. Joaquin Marquesa, of New-Grenada.— This gentleman, it will be recollected, is a vice president of the American Bible Society, and is now deeply interested in the establishment of our new schools in his own country. Another grant of 500 Gospels has been made to a mercantile friend in the city of Mexico, for sale or distribution. Others, if required, are to be forwarded. Another grant

of the same number has been made, under similar circumstances, to a gentleman residing at Havanna; and others have been forwarded to Buenos Ayres.'

Nor is the following account of the progress of the work among the Cherokees less cheering. It is an extract of a letter from the Rev. Cephas Washburn, a missionary among the Cherokees west of the Mississippi:—

'If time would permit, I could communicate some facts of an interesting character, relative to the Bible cause. At present the following must suffice. The next Sabbath after our last Bible Society's meeting, I went out into a neighboring settlement, where I have a stated appointment to preach to the Cherokees. Most of my small auditory were members of the Bible Society. They had just received their books, and you might see each one furnished with a copy of Matthew, the Acts, and a hymn book, and each regarding these books as a most precious treasure. I was particularly interested with one full Cherokee woman. She had her Matthew, Acts, and Hymn book, very carefully wrapped in a new silk handkerchief. Before the exercises commenced, she would carefully unfold the handkerchief, read a verse or two in the book of life, then carefully fold up the books, and press them to her breast, while tears of gratitude for the invaluable treasure bedewed her sable cheeks. When the text, which was Matt. iv, 18-22, was announced, all of them took their books and turned to the passage. Never did I address a more deeply interested company. Among them were several consistent professors of religion who are members of the mission Church. At the close of the exercises, sixteen others publicly expressed a determination to forsake all, and "straightway" to follow Christ. When I had mounted my horse to return home, the woman alluded to above came out and detained me. Her face was bathed with tears, but her eyes beamed with thankful joy. She said, "Have you made the paper (meaning this letter) to the society of good people in New-York, who are helping us to get the word of God?" When I told her I had not, but should do so soon, she said, "Do not forget to tell them that my heart is glad for the books I have obtained, and is full of love and thankfulness to them." "Tell them," said she, "I cannot speak how much we are all glad and thankful, and we pray much for those good people every day." So you see, my dear brother, "the blessing of many who were ready to perish" is come upon your Society. This woman is an instance of the rich grace of God. Her first serious impressions were produced by reading the word of God in her own language. These impressions resulted, as we had the best reasons to hope, in her conversion to God, and she was three years since received into the mission Church. At the time of her conversion she was living in a state of widowhood. Subsequently she was married to one of the chiefs, who was much opposed to religion, and grossly intemperate. Her example and exhortations, joined to her prayers, were the means of his hopeful conversion, and of a revival of religion in the neighborhood, which resulted in the conversion of thirteen individuals. She is again a widow, is poor, and is in very feeble health, but is rapidly growing in grace. She is one of the most faithful Christians in the Church. She lets no opportunity for benefiting

the souls of her people pass unimproved. When she goes to a neighbor's house, or when a visitor calls upon her, religion is almost her only subject of conversation, and every interview is closed with prayer, unless her visitors refuse, and in that case they are the subject of her earnest cries to God in secret. I attribute the prevailing attention to religion, in the neighborhood where she now resides, in a great measure to her instrumentality. How grateful it is to put into such hands the word of life!

In the wide range of the society's operations, the land of the east is not forgotten. And among 'the signs of the times,' which indicate the speedy prostration of idolatry and the uprooting of the foundations of the mighty superstructure raised by the hands of the 'false prophet,' we cannot but notice the glimmerings of light which are tipping the mountains of Mohammedanism, illuminating the dark valleys of eastern paganism, and even penetrating the denser clouds which rest on the hills and dales of Judaism. When the feet of the missionary shall tread unmolestedly the countries which have been so long polluted by Jewish, pagan, and Mohammedan impostures and delusions, with the Holy Bible in his hand, and the Gospel trumpet to his mouth, giving no 'uncertain sound,' we may hope the time is not far distant when these lands of desolation shall be cultivated, when these arid deserts shall become fruitful fields, and when their inhabitants shall be numbered among the Israelites who 'worship God in the spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh.'

Thank God! these signs appear in the east. Along the hills and valleys of Palestine, where Jeremiah wept over the desolations of his country—where Isaiah sang so melodiously of the coming of Messiah, and His consequent victory over the Gentile nations—where this very Messiah appeared, preached, prayed, wrought miracles, suffered and died, and rose again—where Peter and Paul, and others of the chosen band of apostles and disciples, once lifted up their voices in praise and prayer;—even *here*, amidst the 'abominations which make desolate,' set up by the enemies of God and His Christ, are the missionaries of the 'exalted Prince and Savior,' now proclaiming abroad 'the glad tidings of salvation,'—and *here* is the Bible also sent by the munificence of American liberality.

In different parts of the Ottoman empire, where the *beast and the false prophet* have so long held their undiminished sway, this same *witness* for God is wending its way, and speaking in a voice of thunder in the ears of those deluded and lascivious people.

'Within a few weeks,' says this able report, 'an interesting communication has been received from the Rev. William G. Schauffler, missionary of the American Board for Foreign Missions among the Jews at Constantinople, and countries around it.

"The object of this communication," says the writer, "is to make you acquainted, as far as I am able, with the *state of the Jewish popu-*

lation in the Ottoman empire, from that particular point of view which renders them an object of the Christian charity of your society, and then to propose the publication of the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament in the Hebrew and Hebrew-Spanish languages, to supply the perishing wants of these thousands and tens of thousands of immortal souls, all of them still heirs of many a glorious Divine promise, and members of a nation whose universal conversion is so evidently and so intimately connected with the coming of that promised happy period, when all shall know the Lord.

“Who will beforehand prescribe limits to the effects and consequences of the work of putting the whole Old Testament, intelligibly translated, into the hands of probably some 300,000 souls to read, or to hear it daily; a work to the execution of which no hand, nor foot, nor finger ever has been moved throughout vast Christendom down to this present day, although these people have lived and perished before our very threshold!

“But, dear sir, I have not felt satisfied with merely *proposing*, I have already put my hand to the work. I have begun to revise, in the manner above mentioned, the Psalms in particular, to publish them apart in a smaller form. As soon as this revision is completed, I shall, Providence permitting, print an edition of 3,000 copies, confidently hoping the ‘God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,’ who has declared ‘the silver is mine, and the gold is mine,’ will provide for the expenses, by moving the hearts of his people in Christian lands, and, may I not say, by moving *your* hearts?

“The reasons which have moved me to a publication of the Psalms are the following, viz. It is, in the first place, the book which the Jews most desire to possess, and to understand. 2d. It is peculiarly *devotional*, and pre-eminently calculated to prepare their hearts for a favorable reception of the whole of the Old Testament. 3d. It will probably excite less opposition or anxiety on the part of the rabbis than any other book *not historical*. 4th. We shall see, by this small attempt, what is the probability of success in the publication of the whole Old Testament. 5th. Our precious time is thus improved in some way, and something is doing for the poor Israelites. And, my dear sir, I am really unable to fear that Christians in America would forsake me in an enterprise so evidently called for, so limited, and so promising at the same time.

“I deem it a matter of gratitude to the good providence of God upon us, that we can print editions of the Old Testament here. This advantage, which the Bible Society may enjoy freely, does not extend to the publication of tracts. For as tracts against the Jews must be more or less polemical, and as the laborers who set up the Hebrew type in the printing offices are Jews, they will obviously lend no hand to us in combating their cherished infidelity; while, according to the positive opinion, both of Arab Ogloo, the Armenian printer, and Mr. Castro, the Jewish printer, there will be no difficulty in procuring their labors in the edition of an Old Testament; and so confident are they that their men will not forsake them, not even at the threats of the rabbis, that they are willing to take the whole responsibility of that part upon themselves, and expect no pay until the work is carried through the press. But I must close this long communication. Let

me only add, that if your Society conclude upon the publication of the *Old Testament*, less than 6000 copies should not be printed, if there is any prospect of success. In fact, that can only be a *beginning* in the great work of supplying with the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament up to 50 or 60,000 families."

"A letter dated at Constantinople, in September last, from the Rev. Mr. Dwight, missionary, informs your board that a translation of the book of Psalms into modern Armenian had been made under his direction, and would soon be ready for the press. He contemplates printing first an edition of 1,500 copies. When your board have suitable evidence that the work is correctly translated, they will have great satisfaction in furnishing the means requisite to publish such editions as may be required. The following extract from Mr. Dwight's letter will be read with interest:—

"Many of the people around us are not able to read, and of course not prepared to receive the Bible into their houses. Many, nevertheless, do read, and it is astonishing to see the power of Scripture truth upon the conscience, when it comes to them from the pure fountain itself, without note or comment, and without the aid of a living teacher. I could point to two young men of the Armenian nation, for whom we have the hope that they have become true disciples of Christ, whose minds were first opened by the simple reading of the Scriptures, before they knew even that there was a missionary in the whole world. Nay, I could point you to many more of the same nation here, upon whom the word of God has had prodigious power—a few passages sweeping away at once a whole catalogue of errors which they had never, before reading the Bible, supposed to be any thing else but precious truths. Nor, among the Armenians of this vicinity, is there the least opposition to the circulation and reading of the Scriptures. There was indeed a case lately—the first I have heard of the kind—and spoken of by the Armenians themselves as new and strange. A young man, the son of a priest, began to read the New Testament, and became so interested, that whenever he was at home that book was never out of his hands. He is engaged in the mercantile business, and being occupied through the day, devoted his evenings at home to his favorite reading. The old priest, his father, became alarmed—so strange was it that a young man should have such a relish for reading the Scriptures—and tried to prevail on him to devote his time to something else. Being unsuccessful, he at length took the Testament by force and locked it up. The matter, however, had taken too deep hold of the young man, and he soon purchased another one; and the priest finding him incorrigible, has at length yielded the point, and gives him no farther molestation. The son calls at my house every day, and is an interesting and hopeful inquirer after the truth."

"To the Western Foreign Missionary Society at Pittsburg, Pa., there has been made a grant of \$500, to be expended by their missionaries, Messrs. Lowrie, Reed, Wilson, and Newton, in circulating the Scriptures in Northern India.—This mission is to be established among the Seik nation, in the province of Lahore, in the northwestern part of Hindostan. These missionaries pass through Calcutta, where, it is said, they can obtain the Scriptures used by the Seik nation, and by other people to be met on the way thither. Your board are happy in making this appropriation; not only because the object aimed at is important, but because the friends of the Bible in Pittsburg have contributed liberally to your funds for this specific object. Every new channel opened for the diffusion of the Bible should call forth fervent gratitude from every heart which appreciates that blessed book, and sees the universal wretchedness of those who are without its instructions.

"Two letters have been received, in the course of the year, from the American missionaries at Ceylon, asking for printing paper, or for means to procure it, for the purpose of publishing the Tamul Scriptures. One of these letters was accompanied by the last report of the Jaffna Bible Society, Ceylon, from which we make the following extract:—

"There are probably between four and five thousand children under Christian instruction in the schools of the different missionary establishments in the district, a good proportion of whom are able to read. It is evidently of the first importance that these schools should be furnished with a supply of Gospels, not only for the purpose of training the children to read the printed character, but more especially to imbue their tender minds with Scriptural truth, with the hope that, by the Divine blessing, they may thus be preserved from the pernicious and contaminating influence of heathenism, under which most of the adult population is so

powerfully held. To supply each school with ten books, which cannot be considered a large number, would probably require more than a thousand copies; and these, if constantly in use, as it is desirable they should be, generally require to be renewed at least once a year; the habits of native children, even with the most vigilant superintendence, being such as to injure books much faster than in common English schools.

"The committee are also anxious to furnish each youth, on leaving school, with a Gospel, or some other part of holy writ, so that they may possess a book for which, from the instruction they have received, they may be supposed to have some regard, and which they may, it is hoped, read at their leisure, and thus maintain and increase the knowledge they may have acquired of Scripture truth.

"The attention of the committee has frequently been directed to the numbers who, within the past fifteen years have received Christian instruction in these little seminaries, the mission schools. They are now coming forward to act their part on the stage of life, have more or less knowledge of Divine truth, and are prepared, to some extent, to understand the Scriptures. To many of them, it may be hoped, a copy of the whole, or even a part of the sacred volume, would prove an acceptable and valuable present." A quotation is also made from another communication of the committee, expressive of their earnest wish to obtain more books for general circulation. "It has," they state, "been a subject of regret, that they had not at their disposal copies of the Bible, to make a more liberal distribution, especially among such persons as, by means of the various Missionary and Tract Society operations carrying forward in the district, are more or less acquainted with Divine truth, and with their obligations to embrace it."

"The committee regret that in a field where the demand for Scripture is so great, the resources for obtaining funds in aid of the cause are so disproportionate. The annual amount realized by the society is altogether inadequate to meet the expense that must be incurred, if the wants of the district are to be satisfied."

"In view of the above letters and statements, together with a request from the American board of missions, a grant of \$6000 has this year been furnished toward printing and circulating the Scriptures in Ceylon.

"For the circulation of the Scriptures among the Baptist missions in the Burman empire a grant of \$7000 has this year been made. The following extract from a letter by the Secretary of the Baptist board of missions, will show the propriety of this grant:—

"We are urging forward the publication of the Scriptures in Burmah with all the means in our power. In the ship *Cashmere*, which left this port the 2d inst. for Amherst and Maulmein, a fourth printer took passage, with nearly two thousand reams of paper and a great amount of other materials for the press and bindery, under his charge. At the last intelligence, beside an edition of the New Testament entire, which was mostly put in circulation, ten thousand copies of Luke and John stitched together, and ten thousand copies of a Digest of Scripture, by the late Mr. Boardman, had issued from the press. The Old Testament is now doubtless in a course of publication. The 6th of September last the Psalms were commenced, and as far as the 24th printed off.

"We have it in contemplation to send out a fifth press, which may, in fact, be considered as already engaged. The heavy expenditures which these transactions necessarily involve exhaust our treasury fast, and will render highly acceptable whatever remittances it may be convenient for your Society to make. The decision and enterprise manifested by them, and accompanied by the noble resolution in contemplation, to give the Bible to the whole world, have encouraged us to look to their co-operation for most of the means by which the sacred Scriptures shall be given to the perishing millions of Burmah; and the more they authorize us to expect, the more facilities shall we employ to hasten on the accomplishment of the vast and benevolent design."

"The following extract from the journal of the Rev. Mr. Bennett, at Rangoon, October 14, shows that a spirit of inquiry is awake, in relation to Divine truth, although the fear of persecution restrains many from disclosing their feelings and wishes. Opposition, it seems, is made by the jealous Buddhists, who see that their system is in danger. Says Mr. Bennett,—

"The Pahgan inquirer, Ko Long, has been here most of the day, desiring to know more of the truth. I gave him a New Testament, which I pray he may

be enabled to peruse with profit. The man from Ava, (mentioned April 30,) has come down again, and called to-day. He says he gave to one of the king's brothers a book he obtained here; who said, he had one much like it, which he had had for two years, which he had read, and liked, and wished this man to procure him a Testament when he came down to Rangoon. I shall with much pleasure furnish him with not only a Testament, but our other books. He enjoined on this man, however, strict secrecy, and that he must not let any one know he had our books. Several of the followers of this man wished books, which I gave them. This man, and several of his followers, seem very favorable to the truth, but the fear of persecution prevents them from openly avowing it."

'From China your Board have been favored with several communications in the course of the year, parts of which will be subjoined. Soon after your last anniversary a letter was received from the Rev. E. C. Bridgman, missionary at Canton, in which he writes:—

"I made some general statements in a former letter in regard to the extent of the field which is here to be supplied with the Holy Scriptures. Since that time changes have taken place, new openings have been made for the circulation of books, and a better feeling is rising up with respect to this great work, among Christians. Your own inquiries, and those of Mr. Anderson and others, make it my duty to write to you again.

"It is impossible for those who have not given particular attention to the situation and character of these eastern nations, to believe that the Chinese empire alone contains 360,000,000 of human beings; or that those who can *read* the Scriptures in the Chinese language constitute more than one third part of our race.

"For the present the principal part of your grant to this mission will be employed in procuring printing of the Chinese Bible at Malacca. In the meantime, it will probably be best to have some of the separate books published in Canton. The work can be done here with great facility and cheapness.

"In regard to the circulation of the Scriptures I cannot speak definitely.—Many copies will be needed for immediate circulation; and should a missionary ship be sent out to visit the coast and the Chinese settlements, (and it is very desirable that there should be,) many thousand copies will at once be required, and eventually, perhaps very soon, many millions.

"In my best moments, at those times, I mean when I have the clearest views of eternal things, it seems to me that the time *has come* when the Gospel of our Lord shall be published through all the length and breadth of this land, and triumph over and destroy all its vain superstitions. The same opinion is cherished by others, as you will see by the accompanying epistle from our brother beloved, the evangelist Leang Afa."

'The individual above referred to has for many years given evidence of having embraced the Christian faith with sincerity. Soon after his conversion he prepared blocks, and printed from them small books from the Scriptures, for the benefit of his countrymen. By so doing he incurred the displeasure of the government, was arrested, severely punished with the greater bamboo, and then set at liberty. "I dared not," says he, "on account of this suffering, to forget the mercy of our Savior in becoming our ransom. But regarding it a glory to suffer shame for our Lord, I examined more closely the sins of my life, and strove with greater perseverance to live according to the rules of the Gospel." He went to the Anglo-Chinese college at Malacca, where he had the instructions of Dr. Milne until the death of that excellent missionary.

"Having then," he adds, "no one on whom to depend, I returned to Macao, and resided in the house of Dr. Morrison, and for some years studied the Gospel; and by his kind instruction I gradually increased in learning and in the knowledge of the plan of redemption. Then taking the principles of the Gospel, I admonished and instructed my fellow-countrymen. But for a time none believed and obeyed the doctrines of our Lord; recently however, *He* has graciously touched the hearts of some; and now there are among my kindred and friends more than ten persons who believe in and adore the Savior, and live according to the precepts of the Gospel. On every Sabbath day these believers assemble at my house to worship the Supreme Lord; they listen to my preaching, and most joyfully obey and do the will of God. Wherever I preach or exhort, I take these books and distribute them. And this year at the literary examinations in Canton, I distributed them among the literati, who received them with

great joy and gladness. Of both these kinds of books I have distributed all I have. And now the seed of the Gospel has fallen into the hearts of great numbers, and it becomes our chief duty to pray to our heavenly Father that He will send down the Holy Spirit to cause it to spring up and grow, and bring forth the fruits of faith and righteousness unto eternal life.

"For several years I have been engaged either in preaching the Gospel or in distributing tracts; and our Lord and Savior has graciously vouchsafed His grace to protect and to cause me to enjoy peace and tranquillity of mind. I think this is the time when our heavenly Father will allow us to circulate His holy word in order that the souls of the Chinese may be saved. Therefore I write this epistle and send it to your honorable country, to request the Bible Society, which is composed of warm-hearted and faithful believers, that they will extend wide their benevolence, love their neighbors as themselves, and devise means to aid in printing complete copies of the Bible, and thereby enable me to circulate them among my countrymen, and cause them to know the special grace of our heavenly Father."

'From the Rev. Charles Gutzlaff, the indefatigable missionary in China, two letters have been received in the course of the year. In the first he writes,—

"I was greatly rejoiced in hearing that you had taken so active a part in the work of God in China; the sphere for your operations is surely immense. As much as it is in my little power, I shall endeavor to spread the precious word of life, and to make known the saving doctrines of the Gospel.

"You will have heard what resolutions have been taken in regard of bestowing your funds from Mr. Bridgman.

"I should take the liberty of suggesting to you several measures for forwarding the great work in China, but I wish first to act and then to talk. However, you may rest assured that we will drain your funds, for we have a large nation before us, and if only the hundredth Chinaman was to get a Bible from you, a ten years' income would not be sufficient to defray the expenses.

"I am now again proceeding to Fokien or Chekeong; you will have in me a faithful correspondent as long as you answer my letters, and I shall endeavor to give you as distinct a statement about the sphere into which you are about to enter, and the language, as far as it regards Scripture translation, in which you wish to glorify the Redeemer, as my feeble capacities will admit.

"Pray that the Lord may open a great and effectual door. I desire ardently that not only the maritime provinces, but also Gan-hwuy, Hoo-pih, Ize-chuen, and Yun-nan, yea, the whole empire, might see the glory of the Lord."

'In a more recent letter, dated on the 20th of Dec. last, at Macao, he writes:—

"I inform you with the greatest pleasure, that all the parts of Scripture which were sent to my care were distributed to eager readers at Formosa and in Fokien. A total revision of the whole Chinese Scripture is a matter of urgent necessity, and we have therefore set to work to furnish a new edition, in order to answer the wants of the people. Every care and attention will be bestowed upon this important undertaking. Lest, however, a delay in disposing of the whole number might occur, we are anxious to arrange an expedition along the whole coast, from Haenan to Kiren, an enterprise which ought no longer to be postponed.

"If you are willing to supply the demands of China, you will enter upon an immense work. If our missionaries push on boldly, in the strength of the Lord, and constantly travel from one province to the other, the widest circulation of the sacred writ may be anticipated. Only let us not be satisfied with partial success, not slumber as soon as the word of God is printed. The day of small things is past, and it behoves us now to venture all upon the Lord. You can form no idea of the grand sphere upon which you are going to enter; and if our missionaries only keep pace with the zeal and prayers of the people at home, a great and effectual work will be done, under the Divine blessing.

"You have said nothing about the Indo-Chinese translation, viz. the Siamese, Cambodian, and Laos, for the printing of which the Dutch Bible Society has advanced \$800. I have, in the meanwhile, given the whole up to Mr. Robinson, and trust he will expedite the work with care.

"I am very desirous to see at least a few chapters ready for the press ere I leave this, and some parts engraved. As there are more laborers forthcoming, and all are anxious to co-operate in the great work, you must be prepared for heavy demands. Yet we trust to our God, that while doors are opened, the means will also be supplied for carrying on the blessed work."

'In another communication to one of the managers of the society, Mr. Gutzlaff expresses his desire that distribution of books may be undertaken on a much more extensive scale than has yet been attempted.

"As long," says he, "as our relations remain the same as at present, a vessel laden with a great number of books, say one million of volumes, ought to perform an annual voyage from Haenan to Kiseri. As Dr. Parker has come out for the express purpose of settling in one of the provinces, he might serve his apprenticeship in the expedition."

'It must be strikingly evident to all who have noticed the finger of Providence, in relation to China, the last few years, that great changes are about to take place in that populous empire. The eyes of the civilized statesman, of the merchant, and of the Christian, are all turned toward her, and the voice of the whole united world cries for the deliverance of her millions from oppression and ignorance.—It can hardly be presumed that another ten years can pass before wide alterations are made in her diplomatic and commercial intercourse with other nations. Nor can this period pass before the soldiers of the cross, now gathering on her borders, and mastering her complicated tongue, will penetrate the interior of her cities and provinces, and proclaim the news of the Gospel in the ears of thousands.

'It is a circumstance of peculiar interest to this society, in looking at the anticipated changes referred to, that the Chinese are so extensively a reading people, and are eager to obtain books. How much more hopeless their condition, were they as untaught as the scattered tribes of Africa and America. How much more difficult the task of enlightening so many millions, were they strangers to the mechanical process of preparing paper, and to the art of printing. But such are the arrangements of Providence, that, in almost every part of that empire, books can be manufactured at a moderate expense and to an unlimited extent. Let the door but open to admit the merchant, an event which cannot be long delayed, and how rapidly would the knowledge of Christianity be diffused by the press, even should the living missionary be for a time excluded. How rapidly might copies of the Scriptures be multiplied by native hands, and furnished to such as would at once peruse them; and thus many be led, like the awakened Ethiopian, to desire some Philip to come and teach them to understand what they read. The utility of the Bible to China is ingeniously as well as truly represented by the Rev. Mr. Abeel, before the British and Foreign Bible Society at its last anniversary. Mr. Abeel observed, that

"He knew but one missionary in whom he could place complete confidence. That missionary he had met in China; he was instructed in languages, and diligent in exertion; he had made voyages from island to island; he had gone forth unaided and alone; he had entered villages and hamlets; he had dared to enter the palace of him who was called 'the Son of Heaven,' and had ventured to tell him of the true way to heaven. That missionary had done the speaker the honor to be his companion, and such another companion he never expected to find.—Where he could not go, that missionary went; what he could not do, that missionary did. He had never left him. In entering regions which had no teacher, he was still his companion. He went among all classes—he abode with him for weeks at a time, he animated all his exertions; and what was most remarkable, with all his powers, with all his elevation of soul, he became his servant. He entered even the junks, and taught the mariners. He went on, and entered China itself. Surely the audience would all desire to know who he was. He would tell them who he was not; he was not a Churchman, nor a Dissenter—he was not a Calvinist, nor an Arminian—he was not an American, nor an Englishman, nor a Scotchman, nor a Hollander. He appeared to hate all sects, and many of those who were the most prominent he had never even mentioned. That missionary was THE BIBLE."

Through the agency of this and the British and Foreign Bible Society, the holy Scriptures, either in whole or in part, have been translated into one hundred and fifty-eight languages and dialects.

It is known to most of our readers, that in the year 1828 the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was formed by the advice of our General Conference. We were led to this measure chiefly to supply our numerous Sunday schools with the holy Scriptures on the cheapest terms, and the poorer classes of

our own congregations, and also our Indian missions. Though much has been done considering the means at our command, particularly in furnishing translations of portions of the New Testament in the Mohawk language, and the supplying our Sabbath schools with Bibles and Testaments, yet the general efficiency of the Society became doubtful, as it tended to divide the attention of our people between it and the American Bible Society, and thereby in a great measure to paralyze their efforts. On this account some of the zealous friends of the cause considered it their duty to make an effort to amalgamate the two societies, that 'Judah might no longer vex Ephraim, nor Ephraim vex Judah.' This gave rise to the following correspondence, reports, and resolutions, which are published in the report, and that they may be reserved for future reference, in case of need, we republish them as the conclusion of our extracts:—

' Baltimore, July 10, 1834.

'The committee to whom was referred the preamble and resolutions submitted to the board at its last meeting by the Rev. M. Easter, respectfully report:—

'That they have had the subject under consideration, and as the result of their deliberations, unanimately recommended the adoption of the following resolutions:—

'1. *Resolved*, That a copy of the communications herewith enclosed be forwarded to the editors of the "Christian Advocate and Journal," at New-York, signed by a select number of ministers and influential laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city.

'2. *Resolved*, That the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to address the American Bible Society, informing them of the anxious desire of this society to effect a union between the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church and our great National Institution, and of the effort we are making to enlist the aid of that influential branch of the Christian Church in this state; requesting to know the sentiments of the American Bible Society on the subject.

'All which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed)

SAMUEL BAKER, *Chairman.*

JOHN COLEMAN, *Secretary.*

'At a meeting of the board of managers of the Maryland State Bible Society, held July 17, 1834,

'*Resolved*, That the corresponding secretary be instructed to address the American Bible Society, informing them of the anxious desire of this society to effect a union of the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church with our great National Institution, and of the effort we are making to enlist the aid of that influential branch of the Christian Church in this state; requesting to know the sentiment of the American Bible Society on the subject.

Extracted from the minutes.

ELISHA N. BROWNE, *Cor. Sec. of the Mar. Bib. Soc.*

'*To the Editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal.*

'DEAR BRETHREN,—The undersigned, ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of Baltimore, beg leave to address you on a subject of no ordinary importance to the cause of God in general, or to us in particular as Methodists. A Bible convention was held in this city in May, 1833, composed of delegates from many parts of the state, to devise the means of exploring the state, and supplying with the word of truth such as should be found destitute of the sacred volume. A Bible Society was organized by the convention, which has since been occupied in raising auxiliaries in the counties, with branches in the several election districts, to awaken and to perpetuate the proper interest on this deeply interesting subject. In the prosecution of this holy effort, it would appear to be obviously the duty of the Methodists to co-operate, as none can be more concerned in distributing that holy volume which has God for its author, salvation for its end, and "truth without any mixture of error for its matter." Yet our effectual co-operation is greatly embarrassed by what we presume to be the same misunderstanding of the attitude which has been assumed by our Church in regard to this subject. It is believed by many that the formation of a separate Bible Society by the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the purpose of acting independently of the American Bible Society, where a suita-

ble field of labor may present itself, forbids us to unite with the *State Bible Society* in a work which we cannot do ourselves, and which, nevertheless, cannot be done without us.

'You are probably aware of the extensive influence which the Methodists *possess in this state, and consequently of the high responsibility which rests upon them to use this influence to the glory of God. It is generally believed here, that without the cordial co-operation of our ministry and membership, the efforts of the Maryland State Bible Society will prove abortive, and who then shall roll this reproach from our door, and above all, how shall we answer it to God!*

'Can you not help us to reprove the misapprehensions under which some of our preachers and many of our members labor; for we are assured that it is a misapprehension, from the resolutions passed both by our own and the Virginia annual conference, in favor of a similar effort of the Virginia State Bible Society. The Advocate is considered as the organ of the Church, and if our friends were earnestly exhorted through its columns to come up in this matter to the help of the Lord, we are persuaded they would no longer hesitate, because they would no longer consider their exertions in the proposed movement as an act of hostility to the institutions of their own Church—an assurance which can no otherwise be given until the ensuing session of the Baltimore annual conference.

'Most earnestly soliciting your aid in this matter, we are yours in the fellowship of Christ.

GEORGE G. COOKMAN,
JAMES SEWELL,
G. C. M. ROBERTS,
T. P. KELSO,
CHRISTIAN KEENER,
THOMAS E. BOND,
R. G. ARMSTRONG,

W. HAMILTON,
THOMAS C. THORNTON,
FRANCIS MACARTNEY,
SAMUEL BAKER,
FIELDER ISRAEL,
JAMES BRUNDIGE.

Baltimore, September, 1834.

'AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY HOUSE,
New-York, September 18, 1834.

'At a meeting this morning of the committee appointed by the managers of the American Bible Society, to consider the subject communicated in a letter from the Maryland Bible Society, relating to a union of the American Bible Society and the Methodist Episcopal Bible Society, the following resolution was adopted:—

Resolved, That Dr. James L. Phelps, George Suckley, and Francis Hall, Esq., (managers of the American Bible Society,) be furnished with a copy of the above named letter, and that they be requested respectfully to present the same to the officers of the "Methodist Episcopal Bible Society," and the editors of the "Journal and Advocate," and after due conference with those gentlemen respecting this letter, to inform the committee, so far as may be deemed proper, as to the result of said conference. In behalf of the committee,

J. C. BRIGHAM, Cor. Sec'y.

'These documents having been submitted to the managers of the Bible and Tract Society and Sunday School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they appointed a committee to consider and report thereon; and on the eleventh instant the following report was presented at an extra meeting of the board, which was concurred in, and a copy has been sent as directed to the managers of the American Bible Society, and also to the Maryland State Bible Society.

'The committee to whom was referred the communication of the Maryland State Bible Society to the American Bible Society, and the resolution of the board of managers of the latter institution, respectfully report:—

'That the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, and is perpetuated on the recommendation of the General Conference, and that no cardinal alteration in its constitution is expedient, until such alteration be communicated to that body at its next session in 1836, even if such course were desirable, which, in the present case, they are happy in believing is not the fact.

'The specific object contemplated by the formation of our society and its aux-

liaries, was the adequate supply of the wants of our numerous Sunday schools, for which there was no provision by any of the branches of the American Bible Society. This object is still of vast importance, and calls for much more of exertion and liberality than it has as yet received, especially in some of the conferences. It is, therefore, incompatible with our duty and interests, either to dissolve our society, or assume an auxiliary relation to the American Bible Society.

'Toward that noble and popular institution, however, we can have no other feeling than veneration and respect; and in proof of this, if it were necessary, we might appeal to the fact, that several of our board are also acting managers of the national society, and find no incompatibility in their double relation. That great institution has deservedly acquired the confidence of the Christian public for their enterprise and usefulness, which is above all praise. And the Maryland State Society is one of their most efficient and successful auxiliaries, in which we have always rejoiced to hear that very many respectable ministers and members of our Church in Baltimore and elsewhere have been actively and zealously useful. And we unite with them in the expression of regret, that from any misapprehension the Methodist Episcopal Church in Maryland should hesitate in aiding the state society in their laudable exertions to supply every destitute family in their limits with a copy of the Bible, or should seem to be idle or indifferent in this cause. While we should rejoice in the multiplication of our own auxiliaries in that state, yet as we have thus far been denied this pleasure, we shall be perfectly satisfied if our brethren there, and in any state similarly situated, shall organize Bible societies auxiliary to the state and American societies, since both are engaged in the common cause of circulating the Bible "without note or comment." On this broad and catholic ground "we be brethren," and there need be no strife, and in the present case there can be no competition.

'With the view of meeting the present case, and any subsequent one of similar character, your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, which they hope will remove any future misapprehensions on this subject, viz.—

'1. *Resolved*, That it is not expedient before the next session of the General Conference, either to dissolve this society or essentially modify its constitution.

'2. *Resolved*, That as the American Bible Society has the full confidence and Christian affection of this board, we disclaim any design to oppose and hinder in the least the useful operations of that institution or any of its auxiliaries, and should sincerely deprecate such result.

'3. *Resolved*, That the Maryland State Bible Society, being engaged in the praiseworthy effort to supply the destitute within their borders, and being conducted by a board of managers in whose integrity and piety we fully confide, is worthy of the patronage and liberality of the Christian public, and we affectionately commend it to the prayers and contributions of our brethren in that state.

'4. *Resolved*, That the duty of promoting the circulation of the holy Scriptures is obligatory on all the friends of Christ, and we earnestly exhort our brethren to form Bible societies in every station and circuit throughout the land; and although we should prefer that they become auxiliary to our board, yet if any of them should see cause not to attach themselves to us, and discover that they can be more useful by uniting with state societies, or with the American Bible Society, they have our entire and hearty concurrence.

'5. *Resolved*, That should any Bible Societies choose to purchase Bibles and Testaments from our depository, they may procure them on the same terms, whether auxiliary to the American Bible Society, or directly auxiliary to us.

'6. *Resolved*, That a copy of this report be sent to the American Bible Society, to the Maryland State Bible Society, and that it be printed in the "Christian Advocate and Journal." Signed by order of the board,

N. BANGS, 6th Vice President.

SAMUEL WILLIAMS, Rec. Sec'y.
New-York, Nov. 11, 1834.

DESCRIPTION OF A MOUND.

Recently discovered on the banks of the Genesee river.

MR. TUCKER,—If the antiquities of the country are of interest to the agriculturist, I send you for publication in the Farmer the following description of an ancient mound, lately found on the banks of the Genesee river in clearing the land for a crop of wheat.

The mound is about ninety feet in circumference, thirty feet diameter, and eight feet in height. It is in the centre of a flat piece of ground of about six rods square, bounded on the north by a ravine one hundred and fifty feet deep perpendicular banks, on the east by gently rising ground, on the south by another ravine, equal to the one on the north in depth; on the west the river banks descend precipitously to the river about three hundred feet. It is situated nearly opposite the late residence of Mary Jamieson, the 'white woman.' The site is truly romantic, and the prospect the most beautiful that can be imagined, commanding an extensive view up and down the Genesee river, and over the Gardow flats, with parts of the towns of Castile and Perry, and which would be much increased if the woods were more cleared away. On making an excavation into the mound a skeleton was discovered, with the head placed to the centre, lying on the back, the head resting on a flat stone, the arms folded across the breast, and the feet extending toward the circumference of the mound; large round stones of from forty to eighty pounds weight were placed on each side of the skeleton, and over these and the skeleton were placed flat stones. The bones were in a very decayed state, and would not preserve their form when exposed to the air. Parts of three skeletons were discovered in about one eighth of the whole mound, or the section in which the excavation was made.

Over one of the skeletons was placed twenty-six arrow heads, one stone knife, and a stone cleaver; also a copper skewer of about six or seven inches in length, about the size of a pipe's tail, flattened a little at one end, and slightly twisted. The stone knife is of very fine hard stone, clouded green, three or four inches in breadth, and about seven in length, with a small hole in the middle, and about the thickness of a half quire of paper, sharpened edges. The cleaver of about the same dimensions as the knife, cut off square, and several notches made on one end; a hole in the middle. This is of soft slate stone. The pipe bowl was made of coarse sand stone, about an inch square, and rudely ornamented by rubbing notches on the upper edge of the bowls.

All the articles are of the rudest workmanship. Even the arrow heads were the rudest that can be found, and seem to have been made when the skill of making arrow heads was yet in its infancy. Large trees were found standing on the mound. These relics may be seen at the store of D. and T. Aylsworth, on the river road, in Mount Morris. Respectfully yours, &c,

WILLIAM B. MUNSON.

Brook's Grove, Livingston co., N. Y., July 13, 1835.

THE NOBLENESS OF HUMILITY.

On the day of Charlotte county election, in 1799, as soon as Patrick Henry appeared on the ground, says Mr. Wirt, he was surrounded by the admiring crowd, and wheresoever he moved, the concourse followed him. A preacher of the Baptist Church whose piety was wounded by this homage paid to a mortal, asked the people aloud, 'Why they thus followed Mr. Henry about?' 'Mr. Henry,' said he, 'is not a God!' 'No,' said Mr. Henry, deeply affected both by the scene and the remark, 'no, indeed, my friend, I am but a poor worm of the dust—as fleeting and unsubstantial as the shadow of the cloud that flies over your field, and is remembered no more.' The tone with which this was uttered, and the look which accompanied it, affected every heart and silenced every voice. Envy and opposition were disarmed by his humility; the recollection of his past services rushed upon every memory, and he 'read his history,' in their swimming eyes.—*Western Methodist.*

